

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR FEBRUARY, 1837.

Art. I.—*Divine Inspiration ; or the Supernatural Influence exerted in the Communication of Divine Truth, and its Special bearing on the Composition of the Sacred Scriptures : with notes and illustrations.* By the Rev. E. HENDERSON, Doctor in Philosophy. London : Jackson and Walford. 8vo. pp. 574.

IT is an unequivocal and affecting evidence of human depravity, that the inspiration of the Bible should ever have been the object of hostility or cavil. To examine, indeed, the pretensions of any persons or writings setting up a claim to so high a character, and to hold them in jealous abeyance until we obtain satisfactory proofs, is the dictate, not of prudence only, but of wisdom : it is not only allowable, but imperative ; since the interests at stake are far too precious to be exposed, without folly, to uncertainty or hazard. But surely wisdom as loudly calls for candour as for caution. It must be as important to receive what is true, as to reject what is false ; since what is true will inevitably come into bearing upon us, whether we admit it or not, only the more fearfully in the latter case, because it will find us unprepared. This consideration would justly apply to a revelation of an exclusively awful kind, to such an one as announced only terrors, and such an one, therefore, as all must wish not to be true ; but it acquires much more force when applied to the Christian revelation, which is emphatically one of mercy and gladness. Taking the BIBLE in his hand, how fervently any child of mortality and sin may *wish it to be true !* How well might we imagine an inquirer conducting his investigation in a spirit, not merely of candid submission, but of eager hope ; rejoicing in the clearness of any evidence, and trembling lest objections should arise to invalidate his happiness ! There have been men, however, and there still are men, at whose hands the Scriptures have received a far different treatment. It has been their delight to take the opposite side ; to strengthen themselves

in denying the inspiration of the sacred records; racking their ingenuity to invent arguments, or to discern difficulties; and employing sophistry and captiousness as their coadjutors in this melancholy labour? And to what end? To extinguish what *promises*, at least, to be a light from heaven, thrown upon the path of man; and what alone gives such a promise with any resemblance of truth! To throw the human race adrift from their only hope, and bear them floating on in darkness and despair to the impenetrable abyss! To deprive any guilty conscience of its peace, any trembling heart of its repose, any sorrowful breast of its consolation! Such a work, if it were necessary to be done, should at least be done with tenderness and tears; but unbelievers have attempted it as with a heart of adamant, with the recklessness and fiend-like triumph of beings no longer partaking of the sins or sympathies of humanity.

And wherefore? For no other reason than because the word of God is *holy*. This is the secret of their hostility. The bible exhibits a holy God, and requires a holy character. It makes neither allowance for sin, nor compromise with the sinner; and therefore they will try to prove that God has not spoken it. It bears too heavily on their cherished passions for them to admit its truth, while they can give any plausibility to the affirmation of its falsehood. Alas! The power of a corrupt heart! But be it so. We acknowledge it is just the waywardness which a depraved spirit might be expected to manifest. We accept it as an indication altogether in harmony with the sentiment they dispute, and as affording a presumptive evidence of its truth. It was not likely that God should say any thing that could be agreeable *to them*; and their distaste for the communication agrees well with the declared nature of its origin.

The determination and tenacity with which the inspiration of the Scriptures has been attacked, demonstrates also, what indeed is obvious enough, the vital importance of the sentiment. If we would allow the bible to be *uninspired*, infidels themselves would join us in prizing its historical documents, in admiring its poetry, in applauding its morals; but then it would have *no authority*. It could enjoin no duty, it could condemn no sin, it could announce no truth, it could proclaim no mercy, it could exhibit no terrors. The essential question is, therefore, whether *God* has spoken. If he has, and the bible be his word, the volume assumes quite a different character. It is then both light and law; it has then both authority and power; it can then both arrest the conscience and cheer the heart.

There is, no doubt, among the existing population of this country, an almost universal belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Those who are truly pious have a practical evidence of this truth in the power which the gospel has exerted, and is continually

exerting on their minds ; and by a far greater number it is readily classed with ‘ the things commonly believed among us.’ Where there is no experimental piety, however, the belief of the inspired character of the bible must, for the most part, be extremely slight, inasmuch as we cannot assume any very extensive knowledge of the other class of evidences, however satisfactory, by which it is established. Multitudes, doubtless, believe it without knowing why ; and believe it in a manner, therefore, in which it takes no firm hold of the mind, and presents little security against a successful assault. We think that those who have the management of the *Congregational Lecture*, therefore, of which the present is the fourth series, did well in selecting the subject of the volume before us. That they confided the treatment of it to able hands, will be abundantly manifest as we proceed.

We profess ourselves, at the outset, eminently gratified with the manner in which the author has conducted that part of his inquiry which relates to the ‘ positive proofs’ of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It will, we think, enable persons in general to give a more simple and immediately conclusive reason for their belief, than we recollect elsewhere to have seen put into their mouth. But before we enter on this portion of the subject, we shall detain the reader for a little while, on the nature of that divine inspiration which is to be ascribed to the sacred writings. On this point, it is well known, many differences have obtained ; some writers preserving the term inspiration, but with it nothing of substantial value ; while others have carried their ideas of it to an extreme on the opposite side, both unwarrantable and untenable. Dr. Henderson has taken a middle course ; and we beg to commend to our readers the sober and judicious views contained in the following extracts. They are taken from the seventh lecture.

‘ In the first place, the sacred penmen were the subjects of a *Divine Excitement*, when they proceeded to commit to writing those matters which it was the will of God should be permanently preserved. By this excitement we understand, both the supernatural intimation given to the writers, that it was the pleasure of the Most High they should pen any particular book, or portion of Scripture, and also the influence by which they were compelled to comply with such intimation.

Secondly, There was an *Invigoration* experienced by the inspired writers, by which their natural faculties were elevated above the imperfections which would have incapacitated them from receiving those communications of a higher order with which they were favoured ; and by which also they were enabled perfectly to recollect and infallibly to reason respecting truths and facts, with which they were previously acquainted, but which, owing to the lapse of time or the decay of mental vigour, they were unfit, without such supernatural aid, accurately and fully to make known to the world. This energy strengthened their mental powers, giving expansion to the understand-

ing, quickness to the perception, vividness to the imagination, vigour to the memory, and solidity to the judgment, whereby they were rendered capable of receiving and communicating those matters of divine revelation, to which their minds were otherwise totally inadequate. In vindicating to the sacred writers this invigorating influence, we would not be understood as maintaining, that it imparted to them properties in any degree bordering upon omniscience or impeccability. All we contend for is, that in proportion as they required its exercise in order to capacitate them, as percipient and intelligent instruments, infallibly to publish or record the truths and facts of revelation, it was vouchsafed to them. At other times, and in reference to other subjects, it left them in the ordinary circumstances of humanity. . . .

‘ In the third place, it clearly appears from the facts of the case, that, in writing many parts of Sacred Scripture, the divine influence enjoyed by the penmen was that of simple yet infallible *Superintendence*. By this is meant the watchful care which was exercised over them, when, in performing their task, they made use of their own observation, or availed themselves of their previous knowledge of existing documents, or of other external sources to which they had access. In virtue of this divine guardianship, they were preserved from all error or mistake, and committed to writing for the benefit of posterity nothing but what was deemed proper by Infinite Wisdom. That they actually knew much of what they have written, independently of the aid of divine revelation, cannot be denied. They only required, therefore, in such a case, to be excited to commit what they thus knew to writing, and to be so controlled, while engaged in writing, as to produce it with accuracy and truth. As long as their natural faculties were adequate to the task, and when, on being supernaturally excited, they took precisely that course which its proper execution required, they were employed without further aid by the Spirit of Inspiration; but whenever they would have taken a wrong direction, or when there was the slightest liability to present the matters to be recorded in a light or in an order that would in any degree have deteriorated from their utility, his divine influence interposed to prevent or remove it. . . .

‘ We now proceed, in the fourth place, to remark, that *Guidance* was another of the modes in which divine inspiration operated upon the penmen of Scripture. . . . By the descent of the promised Spirit, impediments were removed, and they were conducted to deeper and more enlarged views of the great principles of the gospel dispensation. Under his direction, they taught both orally and by writing; and as the same Spirit, in former times, moved the “holy men of God,” or bore them onward to the delivery of his messages, it is obvious both prophets and apostles were upon a level in regard to the infallible guidance which they enjoyed. They were not left to choose their own way. The path in which they were to proceed was pointed out to them. They were supernaturally excited and strengthened to walk in it. Supernal guardianship was vouchsafed them; and whatever instruction they required respecting the region of truth which lay before

or around them, was fully imparted. In the selection, order, and combination of the facts to be narrated; in the particular line of argument to be employed; in the directions and admonitions to be tendered; and in the peremptory decisions to be given on all points connected with the kingdom of God; they were favoured with the teaching of an infallible guide, to whose omniscient view were present at the time all the diversified circumstances of those into whose hands the Scriptures would come, and who adapted his instructions so as most exactly to meet them. . . .

‘The last and highest species of inspiration, with which we believe the sacred penmen to have been endowed, is that of direct *Revelation*. Besides the various subjects to which we have adverted, as coming within the sphere of their external cognizance, or that were matters of personal consciousness, in recording which they only required to be under the special superintendence and direction of the Holy Spirit, many are to be found in their writings of a description which clearly evinces that they were the result of an immediate influence upon their minds, by which conceptions were produced without the interposition of any human agency whatever. To this head are to be referred all those doctrines which had previously been hid in the divine mind; all knowledge of past events, respecting which no record or tradition existed; all acquaintance with circumstances present in point of existence, but of which the writers could not but be totally ignorant; and all communications respecting future contingent events, the foreknowledge of which is the sole prerogative of Deity.’—pp. 364, 381.

We do not affirm that the scheme thus carefully propounded is without its difficulties. Every view of the same subject has difficulties. But we believe that those which beset the moderate course taken by our author are fewer and less formidable than such as attach to any other. It is a delightful part of this chapter, in which the author, after explaining that ‘the spirit of inspiration’ employed the faculties of *men*, observes, that the men whose faculties he employed for the composition of the Scriptures, were *pious* men; so that he has communicated ‘a large share’ of religious truth in those interesting and attractive forms of experimental and practical godliness, of which there exists a counterpart in the heart of every believer. We cannot withhold from our readers the two beautiful paragraphs which follow:—

‘This view of the nature of inspiration affords a two-fold illustration of the divine goodness. It displays the exercise of that attribute towards the inspired instruments, in permitting them to give expression to the decisions of Christian judgment, and the interesting feelings of Christian experience, while in the act of recording the will of God—a privilege, which they clearly could not have enjoyed, if they had performed a mere mechanical part, or if their intellectual faculties had merely been a channel for the conveyance of abstract truth. Theirs was not the cold and heartless task of communicating matters in which they had no concern, but the exalted felicity of imparting to

others what most deeply interested their own minds. To this there may seem to be an exception, in the case of the writers of prophecy, who did not fully understand the import of those visions with which they were favoured. But, whatever imperfections may have accompanied their subjective knowledge of the truths which they delivered, it is manifest from the statements which they have made respecting the manner in which their minds were exercised in reference to them, that they experienced a powerful excitement, and were led to institute certain courses of pious action, which most delightfully harmonized with the nature of the heavenly communications. Examples in abundance occur in the books of the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, and in that of the Apocalypse.

‘Nor is the manifestation of the goodness of God less conspicuous in such a view of the subject, in regard to the persons for whose benefit the Scriptures were written. These Scriptures are presented to our view, not in the shape of abstract uniform documents, but of historical, epistolary, didactic, prophetic, and devotional monuments, the endless variety of which, created chiefly by the diversity of situations in which the writers were placed, is admirably calculated at once to please and to instruct; while the conviction, that those by whom they were composed were persons, who more or less took part in the transactions which they describe—whose temptations, difficulties, and dangers were, in many respects, similar to our own, is equally fitted to awaken our attention, inspire us with a deep interest in the subjects brought under our review, and produce impressions of a highly powerful and practical character. We naturally identify ourselves with the writers, or with those whom they describe. We are conscious of a sympathy of feeling in all that we possess in common, as fallen and redeemed creatures; and before we are aware we become possessed of many truths, which, but for the vital forms in which they are thus conveyed to us, might not so easily have obtained a lodgment in our minds.’—pp. 359, 361.

In treating of the evidence that the Scriptures are thus divinely inspired, (which he does in the fifth and sixth lectures,) the author divides it into two classes, the presumptive, and the positive. Passing by the reference to geological topics in p. 246, which we do not think either eminently happy, or perfectly correct, (‘the originally liquid state of ‘the earth,’ being, we conceive, indefinitely remote from being either proved by geologists, or asserted by Moses,) we have much pleasure in furnishing our readers with the following quotation:—

‘Of the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets, strong presumptive proof is supplied by the circumstances connected with the discharge of their official duties, as well as by the nature of the messages they were called to deliver. How different their character and predictions from those which distinguished the vates and the oracular responses of the heathen! They were the guardians and interpreters of no oracle. The delivery of their prophecies was not purchased by costly presents, confined to certain days and places, or preceded by any particular cere-

monies. Their announcements were not made in scanty and obscure sentences, in answer to superstitious applicants, and in terms of amphibological import. Neither were they characterized by those hollow and unearthly sounds, which marked the responses of the Dodonean, the Delphic, and other ancient oracles. The prophets had no mysteries to conceal from the light of day. The signs which they furnished, were publicly exhibited: they were submitted to the view equally of the peasant and the prince; they invited the belief of the pious; while, at the same time, they challenged the opposition and braved the contempt of the wicked. They were an order of men, who conducted the whole of their affairs with the utmost publicity. Instead of shrouding themselves in the gloom of a cave, and enunciating their predictions with the studied caution and base timidity of conscious imposture, they appeared in the centre of the metropolis, in the palace of the monarch, before the gate of the city, and in the court of the temple, and denounced in the boldest and most unequivocal terms the judgments of God against every rank of transgressors. So far were they from amassing wealth, and living in luxury, by the price of their announcements, that the only rewards they received were hatred, derision, imprisonment, and death. Where, it may fearlessly be asked, is a parallel to be found in all the ancient world? Does not the case stand out in bold relief from any thing exhibited in connexion with the functions of religious teachers or divine interpreters on the pages of profane history? Was it in human nature to have acted the part ascribed to the Jewish prophets, if they had not really been the subjects of divine inspiration?—pp. 251—253.

With this reference to the heathen oracles, Dr. Henderson has connected a note, from which it appears that, in his judgment, they were wholly fraudulent. We cannot say that we feel satisfied in this conclusion. We know the subject is difficult. We have no doubt that frauds constituted by far the greater part of the system. We should lay little or no stress on whatever statements might be found respecting the oracles in pagan writings. But we do not know how to set aside the records of the New Testament. Had Dr. Henderson forgotten the Pythoness who encountered Paul at Philippi (Acts xvi.)? She is said to have possessed ‘a spirit of divination,’ πνεῦμα Πύθωνος; and we are told that Paul ‘said to the Spirit, I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her. *And he came out the same hour.*’ ver. 16. 18. This surely is not to be understood of a case of absolute imposture. Or if a real Spirit is not allowed in this case, what, under a similar mode of interpretation, will become of the demoniacal possessions mentioned in the gospels? And if one such case occurred, and was turned, as in this instance, to ‘much gain,’ by private persons, why might not persons similarly affected, occasionally at least be in the service of the priests? We have already admitted by far the greater part of the oracular system to be fraudulent, but we cannot help

thinking it had, like most other frauds, a slender basis of reality. It was, we conceive, a system of imposture, founded on some degree of preternatural operation: what degree and of what kind, may probably be explained, by any person who can remove the difficulties which attend the cases of demoniacal possession in the evangelical narrative.

Among the presumptive arguments in favour of the inspiration of the Scriptures, our author notices 'the Mosaic and 'apostolic miracles,' and 'the original reception of the books' in their inspired character. But without dwelling on these topics, we shall proceed to the positive evidence, with the mode of treating which we are eminently gratified. The subject is thus frankly and candidly introduced:

'The arguments which have occupied our attention may go far towards removing doubts from the mind, and preparing it carefully and conscientiously to prosecute the study of the dogma, and impartially to receive whatever farther light may be thrown upon it; but it is not their design, as it is not within their province, to impart a perfect conviction of its truth, or give to it such a lodgment in the soul, as shall inspire an unhesitating reliance upon the testimony of the Bible as the sure and infallible word of God. This conviction can only be produced by evidence, which positively evinces, that the persons by whom the Scriptures were written were in actual correspondence with the Deity; that they wrote by his direction and assistance; or, that what they have delivered to us possesses his sanction as an infallible rule of faith. Except these points be made good, we shall never be practically influenced by their writings, but shall feel more or less at liberty to treat them as we do standards of mere human fabrication—assenting to them or departing from them, as may best accord with our own previous notions of truth and duty.

'It has been customary, without any preliminary or qualifying consideration, to maintain, that the doctrine of inspiration is to be received simply on the declarations of those by whom the Scriptures were written;—that they were infallible, and consequently, if they have expressly affirmed that they were the subjects of such extraordinary divine influence as the term inspiration implies, we are bound, without any further inquiry, to abide by their testimony. On this ground, the doctrine is supposed to possess all the authority of a direct divine sanction; and to press for further evidence is deemed unwarrantable, if not profane. But it must be evident to every one who takes a more minute view of the subject that, to say the least, this is merely to beg the question. It is taking for granted the very point to be proved. It amounts in effect to nothing more than this: the Bible is inspired, because those who wrote it declare that they were inspired—a statement, however, which is by no means universally true; for though it may be shown that some of the writers do advance such a claim, it by no means holds true of them all. We may argue *a priori* in support of the question, and may establish positions in reference to it, which it might be difficult to overturn; but with persons of reflecting

minds, the inquiry will still return: What positive grounds have we for believing that the authors of the books of Scripture really were inspired to write them?—or, in other words, that these books possess a plenary divine sanction?—pp. 280—282.

The evidence usually adduced at this point is that afforded by miracles and prophecies, as establishing the fact that the same writers had received a commission from God, and that they are worthy of credit, in declaring themselves inspired. We say nothing to impugn the force of this reasoning, as far as it extends; but we may affirm of it, first, that it is circuitous, and next, that it is incomplete. The latter point particularly merits observation. Concerning the books of Esther and Ruth, for example, we know neither who wrote them, nor who inserted them in the canon. How do we prove that *they* were inspired? What we want in this matter is *a witness*, competent to give unexceptionable evidence—such as shall not only justify, but demand our belief. It is plain that these requisites do not meet in any of the sacred penmen themselves, even with respect to their own writings, which constitute after all only a part of the volume we maintain to be inspired. We think Dr. Henderson has met the case fairly and fully, and we will present his statement in his own words.

‘In such a view of the case, the only fair and satisfactory process to be pursued, is to narrow the question within certain definite limits, and endeavour to ascertain whether any primary basis can be found, on which it may rest, undisturbed by the attacks of scepticism and unbelief. Now it appears to us that there is only one position, which, in the first instance we can safely and fearlessly occupy, and within the limits of which we must primarily concentrate our forces, if we would not expose ourselves to the reproach of inconsistency, or surrender the truth into the hands of its adversaries. That position is the *authority of the Son of God*, which none can consistently call in question, who does not reject the entire mass of evidence by which his mission, and the religion which he founded, are immoveably supported. If it can be proved, that Christ has attributed to the Scriptures of the Old Testament the qualities and claims of inspiration, then we are bound to receive them as inspired, simply on the ground of his declarations to that effect; or, if he has affirmed, that such endowments should be vouchsafed to his apostles as would invest their writings with similar claims—we are equally bound to acquiesce in the decisions contained in these writings, as the infallible dictates of Jehovah. Whatever, as the Great Messenger sent from the Father, he has been pleased to reveal, it is our duty implicitly and cordially to believe.’—pp. 282, 283.

The testimony thus elicited to the inspiration of the sacred books, is at once simple and direct, unquestionable, and not to be answered. Are we asked for proof that the Bible is inspired?

The reply is, in one word, that Jesus Christ declares it to be so. Into the evidence that he does declare it to be so, our author immediately enters, in a most luminous and satisfactory manner. Of course, the direct testimony of our Lord in this matter must be confined to such portions of the Sacred Scriptures as were extant in his time, that is to say, to those of the Old Testament. This being first established, the rest will follow. It will occur to our readers, perhaps, that there is no passage in which the inspiration of the Old Testament is in so many words asserted by Christ; but that the evidence on this point is ample, will fully appear from the following summary.

First, He mentions several of the writers by name, and ascribes to them in this capacity an authority, which he would not have conceded to any ordinary or uninspired author.

Secondly, He refers his hearers to the Old Testament Scriptures, with the question, 'Have ye not read?' (Matt. xix. 4, xxii. 31;) intimating that, if they had perused them, they would have ascertained the will of God on the subjects on which they had interrogated him.

Thirdly, He speaks of them as a definite collection of writings, an acquaintance with which would prove an effectual preservation against error in matters of religion; and he reproves the Sadducees, who neglected to employ them for this purpose: 'Ye do err, not knowing *the Scriptures, τὰς γράφας*, nor the power of God,' (Matt. xxii. 29).

Fourthly, Our Lord also repeatedly speaks of the Old Testament in the singular number, calling it the Scripture, *ἡ γραφή*, (John vii. 38—42, xiii. 18, xvii. 12;) and most peremptorily vindicates its authority as the word of God, which could not be set aside, or rendered void—consequently was, in point of religious obligation, binding upon all into whose hands it came: 'Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, to whom the word of God came, and *the Scripture cannot be broken*, say ye,' &c., (John x. 34—36.) By law, in this place, he does not mean the Pentateuch, but the whole of the Old Testament, only specifically quoting from the Psalms, as a part of the whole: an idiom frequent both in the Scriptures and in the Rabbinical writings. And of this Scripture, *ἡ γραφή*, he expressly affirms that *οὐ δύναται τὰς λυθῆναι*, it cannot be invalidated—its authority cannot be called in question—it must be received and treated as coming from God.

Fifthly, He further speaks of the writings of the Old Testament under the designation of 'the law and the prophets,' *ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται*.

From these and other passages which might be adduced from the gospels, it is apparent that our Saviour fully admitted the inspired authority of the entire codex received in his day as divine, by the Jews in Palestine. The doctrine of its inspiration is not taught by him in so many express words; but it is so clearly implied in many of his discourses, and is so fairly deducible from the manner in which he refers to it, that, on the contrary supposition, his appeals would lose

their force, and his reasonings be rendered totally inapposite and nugatory.'—pp. 298—303.

With respect to the New Testament, we have our Lord's express testimony to the inspired character, if not of the books, which were written after his departure from the world, yet of the writers by whom they were composed. The proofs of this are gone into at large and forcibly stated by our author, pp. 286—297. Christ thus sets his seal to whatever these his followers should affirm, and renders them perfectly credible witnesses, either to their own inspiration, or to that of others. It is enough, then, that the apostles and other writers of the New Testament Scriptures assume, more or less expressly, the tone and character of inspired writers. After examining in detail the evidence on this point, Dr. Henderson thus gives us his conclusion:—

'Such are some of the testimonies to be found in the books of the New Testament, to the fact of the inspiration of the writers; and certainly, bearing in mind what has already been hinted, that they are for the most part incidental, and not put forth systematically in support of the dogma, they are so highly satisfactory in their character, that, had we no other evidence, we should be perfectly warranted in ascribing all that can be ascertained to have proceeded from the pens of these men, or to have received their sanction, to the same divine influence which Moses and the prophets enjoyed under the former dispensation. The language is of the most explicit and positive nature; and describes an inspiration which extended to all that the writers communicated. They vindicate to themselves and their associates a tuition, which they could only have enjoyed as the result of the accomplishment of our Lord's promise of the Holy Spirit; and they speak in a tone of authority and infallibility, which none was warranted to assume, who did not stand in direct correspondence with heaven, and to which such men as the disciples of Jesus could not have pretended, had they not been specially called to the office which they sustained.'—pp. 335, 336.

The author devotes an entire Lecture (the eighth) to the much disputed question of verbal inspiration. Of course he argues against it, and, although we do not blind ourselves to the intricacy of the subject, we think conclusively. We have no doubt of the motives of those pious and learned men who have maintained, both that the very words in which the sacred penmen expressed themselves were universally suggested by the Holy Spirit, and that this suggestion of every word is essential to the plenary and sufficient inspiration of the whole Bible; but we very much question their discretion. For, if this be so, it follows, in the first place, that no writings can properly serve the purpose of a divine revelation but the originals; since every transcriber is liable to errors, and no copy has been found without them. And then, in the second place, it follows too, that the originals being

unadapted for general use, and being, moreover, long ago destroyed, there is no such thing as a competent revelation from God in the world. If a copy would be without authority, how much more a translation? After the ordinary fate of disputants who take too high a position, the advocates of a verbal inspiration fall into the snare they were anxious to avoid, and undesignedly inflict the mischief of which they accuse their differently minded brethren. Few things are more painful, indeed, than to observe the acrimony with which the controversy on this subject has been carried on by the Verbalists, and the inconsiderateness, to say the least of it, with which charges of heresy and heterodoxy have been flung abroad on the occasion. Even Dr. Chalmers, in the third and fourth volumes of his works, recently published, "on the Miraculous and Internal Evidences of the Christian Revelation, and the Authority of its Records," expresses himself in the following strong language:—

'By the giving up of a universal inspiration, we are left without a Bible—for we are left to guess as we may when it is, or when it is not, that the voice speaketh to us from heaven. It may well be said to emit an uncertain sound, when thus made uncertain of the quarter where the sound comes from; nor can we imagine aught more precarious, than when given to understand, that there is a mixture of various sorts of inspiration in the book, and that all is reduced to a dim and shadowy question of degrees, which is wholly unresolvable. It may continue to be called the Bible. But from the moment we are made to believe it is not all over the word of God, its character, as a clear and unequivocal directory from our Master and Lawgiver in heaven, is henceforth nullified.'—Chalmers's Works, Vol. IV., p. 360.

Now we must take leave to ask why such language should be employed. Does not Dr. Chalmers know that many of his Christian brethren, and some of them not his inferiors in learning and piety, as highly revering the same writings, and holding as firmly their plenary inspiration as himself, adopt the view which he charges with such fatal issues? Is not this quarrel among the friends of revelation materially strengthening the cause of its enemies, and playing the game of the infidel? If Dr. Chalmers and others can see the holy books in the glory of a verbal inspiration, let them to the full enjoy a privilege which no one wishes to disturb; but why must they reprobate brethren who take a somewhat different, but to themselves satisfactory view, and proclaim to the world, that, upon the establishment of a doubtful, if not impossible condition, depends the entire authority and value of the divine word? There surely must be peace among the armies of the living God, if their energies are to be effectively directed against his foes. As to the parade which is made of passages of Scripture in favour of the doctrine of verbal inspiration, Dr. Henderson has with great

patience and candour gone into them, and shown that none of them require such an interpretation.

The Canon of Inspiration, which is the subject of the ninth lecture, with equal importance, presents far fewer and less perplexing difficulties. At least we deem them so. We do not shut our eyes to the real difficulties of the question; nor forget that the formation of the canon, that is, the collection into, and the preservation in one body, of the various writings transmitted to our days, with a claim to have been inspired of God, has nevertheless been the work of *man*, with all his liabilities to error and sin. Especially we do not forget how often it has tauntingly, and even triumphantly (but with a vain triumph), been asked by the infidel, by what men was the sacred canon determined? Show us, unbelievers have been perpetually saying, the time when, the place where, and the persons who met, with learning and skill competent, and with delegated powers authorized, to decide between the conflicting claims of writings pretending to be inspired, on behalf of the church and the world, in all subsequent ages? Nothing will satisfy these sage inquirers but a sort of conclave of cardinals, and a formal decision on each book, *ex cathedra*; an imagination which, if it had been realized, would have been the most undesirable method possible of obtaining the end, and the most open to objection and assault. No such assembly of uninspired men could have been worthy of the requisite confidence; and of men inspired no such assembly could have been necessary. To the canon of the Old Testament we have the direct testimony of our divine Lord and his inspired followers in the New; evidence of the most decisive kind, which our author thus exhibits:

‘In the New Testament the collection of divine Scriptures is represented as commencing and ending with the same books that occupy the first and last place in our present canon. Thus our Lord, designing to comprehend all the instances in which innocent blood had been shed, cites that of Abel, from Genesis, and that of Zacharias, from the close of the second of Chronicles, which is the last book in the Hebrew bible. (Matt. xxiii. 35.) It is also divided into ‘the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms,’ (Luke xxiv. 44), the third of which classes comprehends the Chethuvim, or Hagiographia, according to the custom of the Jews, to designate, by synecdoche, a book, or number of books, from that with which it commences. It also contains direct quotations from, or obvious references to, all the books now in the Old Testament canon, except those of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, the Song of Solomon, Lamentations, and Ezekiel; to which, however, on the presumption that they existed, it does not appear the writers had any occasion to advert. In the present case, as we have already shown, the testimony is strictly divine, being that, either of the Son of God himself, or of his apostles, who were infallibly taught by the Holy Spirit.’—pp. 467, 468.

After noticing the testimonies of ancient uninspired writers, the author of Ecclesiasticus, Philo, Josephus, and others, which fully prove that the canon of the Old Testament was then altogether as it is now, including the Song of Solomon, the author disposes very satisfactorily of the Apocrypha, and then proceeds to the canon of the New Testament. To this we have no *inspired* testimony; which, however, we should have had, if the blessed Author of the Bible had deemed it expedient: and if he has left us without it, it is only because there exist copious and satisfactory proofs.

‘At what time, and by what means, the New Testament canon was completed, it is impossible to determine. That a diversity of opinion prevailed for a time in reference to some of the books now comprised in it, appears from the statement of Eusebius, who, in his classification of the writings of the New Testament, divides them into the *ὁμολογούμενα*, or such as had been universally received, and the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, the genuineness of which had by some been called in question, but yet was acknowledged by most. It is further confirmed by the fact, that the Peschito Syriac version, which there is reason to believe was made very near, if not in the apostolic age, contains only three out of the seven Catholic epistles, and omits the Apocalypse. The very circumstance, however, that the claims of some of the books were, in some quarters, disputed, proves the deep interest which was felt in settling what should, and what should not, be received as the genuine word of God; and the speedy withdrawal of all opposition to the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, in an age when the subject not only engaged the attention, and kept alive the vigilance of the orthodox, but was not unobserved, either by the heretics or by the learned pagan writers who attacked Christianity, satisfactorily shows that, when they were universally admitted into the canon, it was in consequence of sufficient evidence having been produced in support of their divine sanction. . .

‘That not only the gospels, but also the epistles were collected, so as, with the gospels, to form one body of sacred writings as early as the days of Tertullian, is evident from his calling it an Instrument, or rather, he says, a Testament, which designations he gives to it and the Old Testament in common. . .

‘From the investigations which have been instituted respecting the completion of the New Testament canon, it is certain that it cannot be attributed to any legislative enactment, to any decrees of councils, or to any public authority whatever. It was the simple result of evidence elicited by a growing acquaintance with the channels through which the different books might be traced to an inspired source. It was entirely dependent on testimony; so that afterwards, when a decree was issued by the council of Laodicea in the year 363, it was more a declaratory act, attesting the universal prevalence of such testimony, than an authoritative mandate, designed, as such, to be binding on the whole Christian world. The ground of decision was the universal suffrage of the Christian church, which had been constituted a keeper and witness of the sacred oracles, just as the Jewish church

had been in former times. To her care the deposit was committed; she was the pillar and ground of the truth; and upon each of her members, who became possessed of the invaluable treasure, devolved the responsibility of guarding and transmitting it unimpaired to others, according to his ability, and according to the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed. . . .

‘The total result of our inquiry into the canon of inspiration is this: that it never consisted of more, or other books than those which now compose our Bible; that these books were inserted in the canon as they were written, or as it was indubitably proved that they were the product of inspiring influence; that they were received as the oracles of God, or divine Scriptures, by his church, which he had constituted the guardian of the truth; and that they have been transmitted to us in the original languages, and in numerous versions, most of which are independent vouchers for the integrity of the sacred volume.’—pp. 498, 509.

The subject of the concluding lecture is the Cessation of Inspiration; a subject on which it is quite proper there should be satisfactory evidence, but which would possess little interest for us, were it not that the atmosphere of the churches is every now and then disturbed by some new pretenders to supernatural powers. Not that such pretensions themselves are new; they are as old almost as the apostolic age; and the follies of the Montanists stand as the type and pattern of performers in this line in all subsequent periods. We regret our inability to give our author’s argument on this point; as it exhibits, in a compact form, a sample of the close and careful reasoning with which his volume abounds. The lecture is founded on I Cor. xiii. 8: ‘Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.’ To his argument the author adds some interesting observations on the time and manner in which supernatural gifts disappeared in the church, and then, in a not less interesting note, a historical view of the principal pretenders to inspiration in both ancient and modern times. Some attention is here bestowed on the followers of the late Edward Irving. In concluding the account of them it is observed:

‘The present position of the people is very peculiar. A high degree of excitement has been produced by what has taken place among them; and means are still employed for the purpose of keeping up this excitement, and extending it through the country: but the novelty of the manifestations begins to wear away; several distinct and pointed predictions have completely failed; the unknown tongue still remains uninterpreted, while the English utterances, which are still more or less continued, have nothing in them indicative of a celestial origin; all attempts at the performance of miracles have proved abortive; impostures and other evils have been detected; some pious persons, who took a leading part in the scenes which are exhibited, have become con-

vinced of the delusion, and retain so deep a sense of its horrid nature that they find it impossible to rid their minds of the idea, that it can only be resolved into diabolical influence—an immediate inspiration of Satan, wrought with a view to counteract the work of God, which is going forward on the earth. Much anxiety prevails with respect to the disclosures which are to be made by the conclave of the twelve apostles now sitting at Albury, where they were commanded, by an utterance, to remain for a year, in a state of separation from the church and the world; and all sorts of arguments are adopted in order to keep up a conviction that God will reveal himself in the plenitude of his spiritual gifts, whatever may be the result of this or any other particular measure, and whatever may be the disappointments by which the faith of 'the remnant' may be tried.'—p. 570

Besides the ground which we have now gone over with Dr. Henderson, and which might seem to constitute the whole of his subject, he has traversed extensive regions, in which we should with pleasure follow him, if our limits would permit; but we have dwelt so long on what is certainly the main and most important part of his treatise, that we must deny ourselves this gratification. By an extended use of the word *inspiration*, he comprehends within it all the methods which God has at any time employed for revealing his will to mankind; and he gives us elaborate and instructive disquisitions on the scripture accounts of Visions, Dreams, Appearances of Angels, Voices from heaven, and the re-appearance of the dead. These topics occupy the second and third lectures, while the fourth is devoted to a consideration of the Spiritual Gifts, which distinguished the infancy of the Christian church. We will avail ourselves of only one quotation from these lectures (to a concurrence in *all* the sentiments of which, of course, we do not pledge ourselves), containing an explanation of the Bath-kol, and showing the impropriety of employing this Jewish fancy in the illustration of the New Testament; which we do the rather, because in Mr. Townsend's generally admirable arrangement, it is, to our great surprise, identified with the voice of Christ to Saul of Tarsus.

'The Jews have generally supposed that, on the cessation of ancient prophecy, a new mode of revelation was employed, to which they give the name of *בת קול*, BATH-KOL, or, 'the daughter of the voice.' Such of them, however, as use the phrase in this sense, ascribe to it a degree of importance which elevates the communications made by it above those made by what they call the *רוח הקדש*, or the supernatural influence enjoyed by such as were not prophets according to the strict meaning of the term, but yet truly inspired. They make it to consist in a miraculous voice, proceeding immediately from heaven, and imparting in intelligible language the knowledge of the divine will. Yet the instances which they adduce to prove that it took place are so trifling, and so completely Talmudic in their character, as at once to

evince its total discrepancy from any thing justly claiming to be divine. It would seem, from statements made by some of the rabbins, that the Bath-kol was in reality nothing but an extraordinary noise or sound, which, from the peculiarity of the circumstances in which it was heard, might be construed into a good or bad omen, or a communication simply of portentous import. The word *קול*, Kol, being one of those by which thunder is expressed in Hebrew; it has not improbably been inferred, that, by prefixing to it the word *בת*, Bath, or daughter, the Jews originally meant to express the echo, or repercussion, which follows a clap of thunder. Thus, indeed, it is expressly defined in the Codex Sanhedrin: 'Bath-kol is when a sound proceeds from heaven, and another sound proceeds from it.' To such reverberations, or distant sounds, they were accustomed to attach a monitory significance; and so far did they carry the superstition, that, at length, any words which they might accidentally hear repeated, when they were intent on ascertaining a particular fact, they viewed in the light of a supernatural intimation, or a sacred oracle, to whose import they were bound to attend. The application of any of the notions connected with the Bath-kol of the Jews to the elucidation of the New Testament, is greatly to be reprobated. Between such notions and any of the facts narrated in that portion of the sacred volume, there exists not the slightest degree of congruity. Since the use of the phrase cannot be traced further back than an age considerably posterior to that of the apostles, we have no reason whatever to conclude that it was customary in their day thus to designate an articulate voice from heaven.' —pp. 171, 173.

Our general opinion of the work before us will easily be gathered from the preceding pages. We have now no space, and we have little inclination for minute criticism. In general, the language is excellent, and the style, without being highly-finished, is simple, luminous, and forcible; it is thus admirably adapted to the subject, only that we could have wished, both as a matter of good taste, and for the more enlarged usefulness of the volume, that it had been less scholastic. The volume exhibits great stores of knowledge, extensive theological learning (the author is quite at home among the German divines), and very superior logical and argumentative powers. It is highly honourable to the body from which it has emanated, and will, we have no doubt, be appreciated by the learned and the candid of every denomination. We should like to recommend it even to those who might fancy it too learned for them; but for biblical students it will prove in the highest degree interesting and instructive. We have never seen exceeded the patient, discriminating, and candid examination of passages of Scripture, many of them of no little difficulty, with which this volume abounds.

Art. II. *The Life of Oliver Goldsmith.* BY JAMES PRIOR, Esq.
2 Vols. 8vo. Murray, London.

SOME savage nations, it is said, possess canoes formed by roughly hewing, and slightly scooping, the trunks of large trees. However clumsy in appearance, or ill-managed, they at least possess *one* advantage; they cannot *sink*. The immense buoyancy of the materials preserves them from any such catastrophe. Mr. Prior's volumes resemble these primitive vessels. Though ill compacted and clumsily put together, though disfigured by many grave and serious faults, the materials alone will give them an interest, and secure for them a popularity which attach to few books of modern biography.

But some cynical reader may perhaps whisper, that as the materials must necessarily possess the same intrinsic interest, no matter who edits them; the merits of the compiler must, if the above representation be correct, be very moderately estimated. In such a judgment, however, we can by no means concur. Mr. Prior's defects, as we shall attempt hereafter to show, are both numerous and important; but they are at least balanced by his merits; and though it is quite true that the interest of the materials, abstractedly considered, is equally great whoever edits them, it is also true that upon the editor depends the somewhat important question, as to whether there shall be any such materials to edit or not.

In order to form a perfect biographer there must be combined two widely different classes of virtues. Unhappily we so seldom see them united, that they are often, though erroneously, supposed to be incompatible. The one secure persevering, extensive, and accurate research; the other, a tasteful and judicious arrangement and disposition of the materials. If either of these be in any considerable degree wanting, the result will be equally unsatisfactory: we shall have erudition without taste, or taste without erudition; something too heavy to be read, or too superficial to be *worth* reading.

To the first of these very different kinds of merit, Mr. Prior may as securely lay claim as any author we know. With most untiring industry and perseverance he has hunted out every scrap of information that could in the slightest degree illustrate Goldsmith's character, habits, or history. Not content with the sources of information which England and Ireland supplied, he has in several instances directed the archives of foreign universities, in which Goldsmith studied or which he visited, to be searched; often with but a very slender hope of obtaining some acquisition to his stores. Not content with printed or public documents, he has rummaged all sorts of private repositories, delved into the recesses of domestic history, turned out the pockets of our grandmothers, examined old family account-books, fished up grocers' and tailors' bills of three generations back, and by so

doing, has presented us with some highly curious, if not always valuable, information. Nor has his research been merely extensive and untiring; it must be confessed that he has often carried it on with distinguished sagacity and acuteness. The obscurest clue, the slightest hint, is often skilfully followed up until it issues in the authentication of some important or interesting fact; the faintest scent is pursued over hill and dale, hedge and ditch, from hand to hand, from tradition to obscure record, or from document to document, till it is at last fairly unearthed in some long extinct magazine, or some dirty pamphlet which has by miracle escaped the cheesemonger, or the musty recesses of some old family papers. It is proper to observe, that the same spirit of research characterises the book throughout; the author appears to bestow as much pains on the verification of an unimportant date or trivial occurrence as the generality of writers would expend on points of vital importance. Upon the whole, it is but justice to Mr. Prior to say, that he has presented us with a mass of information respecting Goldsmith's history, which, at this time of day, we should hardly have thought it possible to reclaim; and that if he had done nothing more than snatch from oblivion the exquisite letters of his author which enrich these volumes, he would have well entitled himself to the gratitude of all lovers of our literature.

But here our praise of our author must end; for few writers, we apprehend, could have used their materials with less judgment. His principal defects are as follows. In the first place he seems to have no perception of the *relative* value of his materials. He details with as much particularity, the most trivial and the most important matters; and gives equal prominence to the most worthless and the most valuable parts of his narrative. It may be curious and interesting it is true, to know how much it cost Goldsmith to have his shoes cleaned per quarter, or what price he paid for his manifold pairs of silk breeches; but we cannot think it was necessary to describe such matters with so much particularity, or to give them so much space as our author has done. To the same fault are to be attributed the very frequent and long digressions on matters only collaterally, and often very remotely, connected with Goldsmith's history; as for instance, the lives of his contemporaries, the rise and progress of the various periodicals in which he wrote, and certain facts, (frequently we allow, very curious and valuable,) illustrative of the literature of the age. No matter how slight the connexion between Goldsmith and the parties with whom his literary career brought him into contact, our author has no sooner mentioned one of them than he ruthlessly turns out upon us the whole contents of his voluminous collections, instead of simply selecting from them only such facts as really tended to illustrate Goldsmith's life and character.

The consequence is, that the thread of the narrative is continually broken; instead of a luminous and continuous view of Goldsmith's history, we are perpetually obliged to wait while Mr. Prior is rambling into a long digression on the history and adventures of some literary contemporaries; often by the way, amongst the obscurest dzu'dges of periodical literature. In the first volume alone we have sketches of the lives of Carolan and Laurence White, the Irish bards, Mr. Lauchlan Maclean, Dr. Farr, Dr. Grainger (seven pages with notes '*to match*,') Kenrick, Edward Purdon, Pilkington, and others. In the same manner he has crammed into the book, notes of money-transactions between Mr. Newbury, the bookseller, and Dr. Johnson, containing nothing more worthy of note than this: "Lent Mr. Johnson so much;" "Dear Sir, I beg the favour of you to lend," &c. He has done the same in the case of Dr. Dodd, nay, has filled not less than four pages in the shape of foot-notes, with the letters of the Doctor, in not one of which can we see a single sentiment or expression worth preserving. Now however *curious* such matters may be, the natural question is, what have they to do with the life of Oliver Goldsmith? They should obviously have been introduced only *so far* as they crossed the path of his history, or tended to illustrate his character; or if Mr. Prior thought it desirable to give us still further details, they should have been compressed, and even then thrown into the form of an appendix. As it is, Mr. Prior reminds us of a ship which has charge of a large convoy; instead of sailing on at once to the place of its destination, it is compelled perpetually to shorten sail, while some lagging merchantman brings up its lee-way; or he resembles the author of some ill-concocted drama in which the action is continually flagging from the introduction of scenes and characters no way german to the matter. We admit, indeed, that after diligent research has opened some very curious and novel stores of information, it seems hard to throw them aside unemployed. Still it is obvious, that if an author is writing the life of an individual, such details must be excluded; they can find a proper place only in a work of a miscellaneous character. And by the way, if we might take the liberty of advising Mr. Prior, we would earnestly solicit him to furnish us (and if he has many such materials as he has *thrust* into the life of Goldsmith, the work would give him very little trouble,) with a supplement to one of the most interesting books in our language; we mean D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*.

Another fault of our author, and which also seriously tends to break the continuity of the narrative, is the tedious particularity with which he has detailed the *sources* of his information, and the modes in which he became possessed of certain facts. However long and wearying his chase, however far his research leads him, he compels his readers to follow, and gives them nearly as much

trouble in showing them *how* he acquired such and such facts, as he had in obtaining them. In the same manner, if he has to controvert the statement of some former writer, or to correct a mistake in names or dates, he often formally introduces into the text itself all the grounds on which he founds his opinion, instead of simply stating the result. Now it is plain that such matters as these should not be introduced into the text at all; in order to render the narrative clear and unbroken, such matters should, as far as possible, be stated in the preface, and where that is not possible, they should be thrown into the appendix.

A fourth fault of Mr. Prior, is a propensity to indulge in long-winded, and oftentimes exceedingly unedifying reflections and disquisitions. Where such reflections and disquisitions are novel and important in themselves, and naturally suggested by the narrative, they constitute one of the most pleasing features in biography. They present us with philosophy in her most attractive form, and instruct while they delight us. In such reflections consists one of the great charms of Johnson's 'Lives of the Poets,' and of many other works of biography. The reflections of Mr. Prior, however, are for the most part of a very different stamp; being often trite, and almost always tedious. One instance, by way of justifying our remarks, we cannot refrain from citing. It is matter of report, that when Goldsmith was making his celebrated pedestrian tour, a young Englishman was consigned to his care; it is also reported that the connexion between the tutor and pupil soon ceased, from the total dissimilarity of their characters. As the fact is wholly unimportant, and rests merely on conjecture, a passing mention of it would appear to be all that was requisite; yet Mr. Prior proceeds, at considerable length, to reason on the *probability* of the story being true, chiefly on the ground, that an incident of a somewhat similar character is introduced into Goldsmith's beautiful novel of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' combined with the author's well known habit of working up the incidents of his own most eventful life into the form of fiction. Mr. Prior then proceeds to indulge in the following moral prosing.

'Between the improvident and the parsimonious, there can be no permanent bond of union: if positive antipathy be not engendered between persons of such opposite qualities, their acquaintance never ripens into friendship, for they cannot pardon the peculiarities of each other. The improvidence of the poor always astonishes the wealthy. The avarice of the rich, on the other hand, is ever incomprehensible to the poor,' &c.

This is only one out of numberless instances; indeed Mr. Prior has as grave a way of stating truisms as any writer we know.

But it is now time that we should give our readers a taste of the entertaining and instructive matter which Mr. Prior has here

collected. We shall first, however, offer a few observations on Goldsmith's history and character generally.

We must confess then that we have risen from Mr. Prior's volumes with a far more favourable view of Goldsmith's character than we had ever before entertained. He has done justice, not merely to his genius, (of which indeed his writings are the best and most unequivocal evidence,) but to the many excellent qualities, to which little attention had been paid, or which misrepresentation, slander, or envy had obscured; to his fortitude, his perseverance, his simplicity, his benevolence, his good-nature. He has fully vindicated him from the mean and malevolent attacks of that prince of coxcombs, Boswell; who seldom introduces his name unaccompanied by some ungenerous attempt at depreciation. Indeed, all literary men of any eminence, who have investigated this subject, have expressed their surprise and indignation at the gross injustice with which Boswell has treated him. There is one point, however, in which we cannot think that Mr. Prior has materially affected Boswell's assertions; we mean with respect to Goldsmith's ruling foible of vanity. That he was characterized by this quality, in no inconsiderable degree, we believe, not merely because Boswell has said so, but from the concurrent testimony of all Goldsmith's contemporaries; we might even add that, in the absence of the very highest and noblest principles of action, (of which in his earlier career at least, Goldsmith appears to have been sadly destitute,) nothing but the possession of such a quality could have sustained him under that load of poverty and insult by which, during so large a portion of his life, he was nearly crushed. Under such circumstances vanity is often a sort of defensive armour, which repels the shafts of insult and slander; the oil upon the waters, which breaks the angry surges of the world's unkindness; a secret comforter in the bosom, which fortifies wounded pride and injured sensibility, by imparting an assurance which modesty can never reach, that the assaults from which they suffer are but the assaults of malice and envy!

The records of genius, in general, are melancholy enough; but we must profess our belief that, with the exception of Savage and one or two others, there is no man whose history is so melancholy as that of Goldsmith. The difficulties with which he had to contend, throughout the whole of his earlier career, indeed until he was forty years of age, (he died at the early age of forty-five), are enough to appal the stoutest heart; and show that he must have possessed wondrous buoyancy and elasticity of mind to bear up under them. To read his life is enough, one would think, to make the most eager aspirant for fame exclaim, in the words of Hotspur,

'I had rather be a kitten, and cry mew,
Than one of these same metre ballad-mongers;'

Nor is there, perhaps, a more striking proof of the thirst for fame and the love of knowledge, which animate the bosom of youthful genius, than the fact, that with such memorable beacons before its eyes, it should still throw itself upon literature for subsistence.

It must be granted, indeed, that much of Goldsmith's misery is to be attributed to his own folly and imprudence; but he also endured much, very much, that can be attributed to no such causes. It is true, however, that he possessed all those failings and eccentricities, which so often characterize poetical genius, and which, in accordance with that principle of compensation which pervades the whole of this lower world, fully balance the equivocal advantages of great intellect. He possessed that ambition which rendered his long years of obscurity and neglect the more galling; that susceptibility which gave to contempt and insult a double sting; that simplicity of character, which rendered him the prey of the crafty and designing; that improvidence and extravagance, which forgot the necessities of to-morrow in the gratifications of to-day; and a generosity and benevolence so reckless and absurd, that he was not only deaf to the claims of justice, but often induced to spend the very sums he had received in charity, in charity again. Of this reckless generosity, a most amusing anecdote is told in Mr. Prior's first volume; it occurred while poor Goldsmith was a student at Dublin University.

'Mills, whose family in Roscommon was opulent, possessing a handsome allowance at the University, occasionally furnished his relative with small supplies, and frequently invited him to breakfast. On being summoned on one occasion to this repast, he declared from within to the messenger his inability to rise, and that to enable him to do so they must come to his assistance, by forcing open the door. This was accordingly done by Mills; who found his cousin not *on* his bed, but literally *in* it, having ripped part of the ticking and immersed himself in the feathers, from which situation, as alleged, he found difficulty in extricating himself. By his own account in explanation of this strange scene, after the merriment which it occasioned had subsided, it appeared that while strolling in the suburbs the preceding evening, he met a poor woman with five children, who told a pitiful story of her husband being in the hospital, and herself and offspring destitute of food, and of a place of shelter for the night; and that being from the country, they knew no person to whom under such circumstances they could apply with hope of relief. The appeal to one of his sensitive disposition was irresistible; but unfortunately he had no money. In this situation he brought her to the college gate, sent out his blankets to cover the wretched group, and part of his clothes in order to sell for their present subsistence; and finding himself cold during the night from want of the usual covering, had hit upon the expedient just related for supplying the place of his blankets.'

At another time, when a youth, and with nothing more than

five shillings in the world, he parted with half of it to a poor woman, who told him one of the usual pitiable stories, 'of a husband and large family being ready to starve,' &c. and then he asks, with most amusing *naivete*, 'And pray, mother, ought I not to have given her the *other* half-crown, for what she got would be of little use to her?'

Nor had he simply the eccentricities and irregularities of the imaginative temperament to contend with; he seems to have been distinguished by all those qualities which constitute the Irish national character; the same warmth of heart and want of prudence, the same reckless generosity and improvidence, the same love of social enjoyment. Nay, if Mr. Prior's representation be correct, he must have been a Hebrew of the Hebrews, the quintessence of an Irishman; for it appears that his whole race was characterized by a most marked predominance of the very same qualities. 'In conversing with three branches of the family,' he tells us, 'in as many different quarters of Ireland, the remark of each ran nearly in the same words; 'the Goldsmiths were always a strange family; they rarely acted like other people; their hearts were always in the right place, but their heads seemed to be doing anything but what they ought.''

The adventures of such a character might be expected to be singular; and in truth they were singular enough. Few men have seen more of 'many coloured life' than poor Goldsmith; and of him it might be said, with at least as much truth as of Ulysses, in the words of old Homer,

———— Πολυτροπος ος μαλα πολλὰ
 Πλαγχθη
 Πολλων δ' ἀνθρωπων ἰδεν ἀστεα, καὶ νοσὸν ἐγνώ.'

He was born, November 10, 1728. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Trinity College, Dublin, as a sizar. From the mortifications which he endured there, the uncongenial nature of his principal studies, the consequences of his frequent irregularities, and the brutal insults of his tutor Wilder, he always looked back upon his college life with the bitterest emotions. Even at this early period, the straitness of his finances compelled him to commence the hard life of one who scribbles for his bread.

'Goldsmith was now taught for the first time to draw upon his resources in a mode which, however beneath the dignity, was not inappropriate to the calling of the future poet. This was the composition of street ballads, to which Beatty, a fellow student, knew him frequently to resort when in want of small sums for present exigences. The price of these was five shillings each, and all that he wrote found a ready sale at a shop known as the sign of the Rein-deer, in Mountrath Street. None of the names of these verses were recollected at the time Mr. Beatty related the fact to his friends, but popular occur-

rences commonly supplied the subjects. Poor as they may be supposed to have been in character, from the remuneration received and the class for whom intended, he is said to have exhibited for his offspring all the partiality of a parent, by strolling the streets at night to hear them sung, and marking the degree of applause which each received from the auditors.'

Whatever he learned at Dublin, and he seems to have read a good deal, though of a miscellaneous character, he does not appear to have troubled the severer sciences much. As Mr. Prior justly remarks, Goldsmith was, in all probability, drawing his own early character, when in writing the life of Parnell he observes, 'his progress through the college course of study was probably marked by little splendour; his imagination might have been too warm to relish the cold logic of Burgersdicius, or the dreary subtleties of Smiglesius.'

Of the vacant and indolent mood in which he often sat down even to more congenial studies,—studies which he would have been the last to characterize as conversant only with 'dreary subtleties,'—we have a proof in the edifying notes in the margin of his Latin dictionary, which is still preserved. Amongst other memoranda of about equal importance, was frequently found the prophetic form, 'I promise to *pay*, Oliver Goldsmith;' promises, alas! which then, as at a later period, he found it more easy to *make* than to *fulfil*.

It is of course impossible, within the narrow limits of an article like the present, to give in detail the transmigrations through which Goldsmith passed. Having finished his somewhat unsatisfactory career at College, and having led for some time a scrambling life amongst his friends, principally with his mother,* (his father died while he was at the University,) he, in an incredibly short time, made a movement towards each of the liberal professions; the church, the law, a tutorship, and medicine.

* Of the humble manner in which Mrs. Goldsmith lived, an estimate may be formed, from accounts of grocery, &c. which Mr. Prior has given us, first printed in Mr. Shaw Mason's statistical survey. In these accounts Oliver, who it appears was often his mother's errand boy, is somewhat irreverently called Master Noll.

'One of the accounts, in 1756, may be considered a curiosity, ascertaining the use and the price of green tea in this part of the country, nearly eighty years ago.

' Mrs. Goldsmith to Sarah Shore, Dr.

Brought forward	0	15	5
Jan. 16. Half an ounce of green tea	0	0	3½
A quarter of a pound of lump sugar	0	0	3½
A pound of Jamaica sugar	0	0	8
An ounce of green tea	0	0	7
Half a pound of rice	0	0	2
A quarter of an ounce of green tea	0	0	2'

He failed in the first, it is said, because, when he presented himself before the Bishop of Elphin for ordination, he thought proper to appear in a pair of 'scarlet breeches!' It is also said, however, that the fame of his irregularities at college had gone before him, and that this was the cause of his rejection. To do Goldsmith justice, he was not sorry for this failure; and indeed the application had been made rather in compliance with the wishes of others than with his own. He always maintained (and who could gainsay him?) that he was not fit for the sacred office.—His tutorship he retained about a year. He then resolved to go abroad, and actually set forth on a good horse, and with about thirty pounds in his pocket. At the end of six weeks he again appeared, without a sixpence, and mounted on a miserable hack, which he had humorously named 'Fiddle-back.' His next attempts were still more disastrous. Having been provided by a generous relative (Mr. Contarine) with fifty pounds, he was sent to Dublin, on his way to London, to keep his terms as a law student; but no sooner had he reached Dublin, than he lost every penny in a gambling-house, and returned in shame and beggary to be a burden and reproach to his reduced family. Some time after he was sent, by the generosity of the same relative, to Edinburgh, to study medicine; where he passed his time much in the same manner as at Dublin University. From thence he went to Leyden; and having spent a season there, set out almost penniless on his celebrated pedestrian tour of Europe. He begged his way from town to town and village to village; and often earned his supper and his bed, by playing to the simple peasants on his German flute. In about two years, having seen and learned something of every mode of life, without being exactly fitted for any, he returned to London 'without friends, recommendations, money, or impudence.' In an incredibly short space, he passed through a series of transformations which would have confounded Proteus himself. He first became, though for a very short time, an usher; then an assistant to a chemist and apothecary; then established himself as a physician, 'in an 'humble way,' to use his own words, in Bankside, Southwark; scribbled a tragedy now lost; and dreamed of a strange Quixotic scheme of going to decipher the inscriptions on the *written mountains*, although utterly ignorant of Arabic, or of any languages in which those inscriptions might be supposed to be written. A short time after, we find him again doffing his physician's uniform of 'tarnished green and gold,' and resuming his character of usher, at a large school at Peckham; he then became a literary hack to Griffiths, the editor of the *Monthly Review*, writing, as he declares, 'from nine o'clock till two, and frequently the whole 'day.' A quarrel with Griffiths, or his wife, or both, terminated this connexion in a few months, when he once more put on his

old suit of 'green velvet,' and as he expresses it, 'by a very little practice as a physician and a very little reputation as a poet, 'made a shift to live.' He then drudged successively in the *Literary Magazine* and the *Grand Magazine*; not to mention compilations, translations, and prefaces without end. Still half-starved, he sought to eke out his miserable income, by resuming his situation in the school at Peckham. At the close of 1758, a medical appointment abroad was procured for him; and in December of that year he presented himself at Surgeons' Hall, 'in a borrowed suit,' for examination. Unfortunate wretch that he was, he was the only unsuccessful candidate! He then once more took up his well-worn crow-quill, published his first considerable work, 'The Inquiry into Polite Learning,' and again scribbled on in the *Critical Review*, the *Bee*, the *Busy-body*, the *Lady's Magazine*, the *British Magazine*, the *Martial Review*, the *Christian Magazine*, and the *Public Ledger*; in which last appeared the celebrated *Chinese Letters*, a work which first stamped his fame as a writer. His circumstances had now become considerably easier by his connexion with Mr. Newbery, of St. Paul's Church Yard, the well-known children's bookseller; yet even in this improved state of his finances his life must have been one of intolerable drudgery, as is proved by the various labours of one year, of which Mr. Prior has given a curious list, and for which the remuneration did not amount to more than one hundred and twenty pounds.

'It may be a source of curiosity therefore to trace his income as far as can be ascertained, during this year of acknowledged industry. The pamphlet on the Cock Lane Ghost as appears was three guineas; the history of Mecklenburgh, if he were actually the author, may be estimated by the value of other works at twenty pounds; revising the *Art of Poetry* ten pounds; seven volumes of *Plutarch* forty-five pounds; *Citizen of the World* [written before] probably ten or fifteen pounds; five sheets of the *History of England* two guineas; *Life of Nash* fourteen guineas; occasional pieces, such as *Essays*, *Prefaces*, and *Criticisms*, perhaps twenty pounds, making together less than one hundred and twenty pounds. When we consider the time required for these various works, it is not probable he could have written any thing of moment for another publisher; and there is little doubt, as we find in the instance of Collyer, that he occasionally paid for assistance. With this deduction from small means there might still be something left for a strict economist, though little to gratify the pride of literature; and in all the labours of the year there was nothing conducive in any degree to fame.'

With the improvement in his circumstances he removed from Green Arbour Court, in the Old Bailey, where he had lived in a state of 'squalid poverty,' to respectable lodgings in Wine Court, Fleet Street, and subsequently to Islington, to the house of a Mrs.

Fleming. Here he boarded and lodged for fifty pounds a year, 'which his publisher, Mr. Newbery, as his usual cash bearer, 'paid quarterly, taking credit for such payment in the settlement of accounts.' Mr. Prior has recovered a curious bill of his landlady for one quarter, which we here subjoin, for the amusement of the reader.

Here he continued a resident during the whole of 1763 and part of 1764; and as illustrative of his private habits, the following bill of his landlady for the items of expense during a quarter will gratify curiosity. By this he appears to have been fond of sassafras, a decoction of which was then in vogue as an innocent and wholesome beverage, though now chiefly confined to medical purposes. The dinners mentioned without any price affixed were given to visitors of her lodger, and seem introduced in order that the generosity of his hostess towards him and them should not be forgotten. To the bill is appended the particulars of the account of his laundress, which it is scarcely necessary to transcribe: the items sufficiently prove that if formerly open to the charge of neglecting his linen, it could not now justly be brought against him.

1763. Dr. Goldsmith,		Dr. to Eliz. Fleming.	
Aug. 22.	A pint of mountain	0	1 0
	A gentleman's dinner	0	0 0
24.	A bottle of port	0	2 0
	4 gentlemen's teas	0	1 6
28.	Dr. Reman's dinner		
	and tea	0	0 0
Sept. 5.	— dinner	0	0 0
7.	Sassafras	0	0 0
11.	Dr. Reman's dinner	0	0 0
29.	A bottle of port	0	2 0
	Mr. Baggott's dinner	0	0 0
Oct. 6.	Sassafras	0	0 3
10.	Mr. Baggott's tea	0	0 0
14.	Paper	0	1 0
24.	Sassafras	0	0 3
25.	Paid the newsman	0	16 10½

30.	Wine and cakes	0	1 6
31.	To the Rev. Mr. Tyrrell	0	2 6
	Mr. Baggott's dinner	0	0 0
	Sassafras	0	0 6
Nov. 5.	Ditto	0	0 6
	10 sheets of paper	0	0 5
8.	Pens	0	0 2½
	Paper	0	1 0
	Sassafras	0	0 6
	To 3 months' board	12	10 0
	To shoes-cleaning	0	2 6
	To washing	0	18 0½
		£	15 3 0½

Received, Dec. 2, 1763, by the hands of
Mr. Newbery, the contents in full.
ELIZ. FLEMING.

But though poor Goldsmith's circumstances were certainly improved, he was by no means exempted from occasionally feeling poverty in its most humiliating forms. The story of his being arrested by his landlady, (though not, as we think Mr. Prior rightly maintains, by the worthy woman who gave her lodger's hungry brother-authors their dinner *gratis*), and of Johnson's selling his *Vicar of Wakefield* to extricate him from the difficulty, is well known. His difficulties have often been imputed to his extravagancies and thoughtless generosity; and in part, no doubt, they are to be attributed to these causes. At the same time it must be admitted that, whatever his extravagancies, the preceding account shows plainly that

they were not in his *housekeeping*; his greatest *personal* expense appears to have been his dress, as the heavy bills of his tailor, worthy Mr. William Filby, preserved in Mr. Prior's second volume, too sadly prove.

It is not necessary to follow Goldsmith's career any further; shortly after the date of the preceding bills, he published his '*Traveller*,' and immediately took his place amongst the first writers of the age.

It is proper to add, however, that even after he had achieved fame and established his character, his life was still one continued struggle with poverty. The tales which have been long current of the large sums he realized by his productions, appear to be entirely devoid of foundation. It is certainly a disgrace to the government of the day, that, while many worthless blockheads fattened upon undeserved pensions, Goldsmith, though he had established so splendid a reputation, and had contributed so much to the glory of our literature, was left to maintain to the last a precarious struggle for existence, and, as there is too much reason to believe, in some measure fell a victim in the arduous and harassing strife.

Of the obstacles with which he had to contend, in the earlier part of his career—of the sordid want by which he was oppressed, no language can give so vivid a picture as certain affecting passages in some of his own inimitable letters, or certain notorious facts of his melancholy history.—Take, for example, the following, from a letter to Daniel Hodson, Esq., of Lishoy, near Ballymahon, Ireland:—

'Dear Sir,

It may be four years since my last letter went to Ireland—to you in particular. I received no answer; probably because you never wrote to me. My brother Charles, however, informs me of the fatigue you were at in soliciting a subscription to assist me, not only among my friends and relatives, but acquaintance in general. Though my pride might feel some repugnance at being thus relieved, yet my gratitude can suffer no diminution. How much am I obliged to you, and to them, for such generosity, or (why should not your virtues have their proper name?) for such charity to me at that juncture. Sure I am born to ill fortune, to be so much a debtor and unable to repay. But to say no more of this: too many professions of gratitude are often considered as indirect petitions for future favours. Let me only add, that my not receiving that supply, was the cause of my present establishment at London. You may easily imagine what difficulties I had to encounter, left as I was without friends, recommendations, money, or impudence; and that in a country where being born an Irishman was sufficient to keep me unemployed. Many in such circumstances would have had recourse to the friar's cord, or the suicide's halter. But with all my follies I had principle to resist the one, and resolution to combat the other.

'I suppose you desire to know my present situation. As there is nothing in it at which I should blush, or which mankind could censure, I see no reason for making it a secret. In short, by a very little practice as a physician, and a very little reputation as a poet, I make a shift to live. Nothing is more apt to introduce us to the gates of the muses than poverty; but it were well if they only left us at the door. The mischief is, they sometimes choose to give us their company at the entertainment; and want, instead of being gentleman-usher, often turns master of the ceremonies.

'Thus, upon learning I write, no doubt you imagine I starve; and the name of an author naturally reminds you of a garret. In this particular I do not think proper to undeceive my friends. But whether I eat or starve, live in a first floor or four pair of stairs high, I still remember them with ardour; nay, my very country comes in for a share of my affection. Unaccountable fondness for country, this *maladie du pais*, as the French call it! Unaccountable that he should still have an affection for a place who never, when in it, received above common civility; who never brought any thing out of it except his brogue and his blunders. Surely my affection is equally ridiculous with the Scotchman's, who refused to be cured of the itch, because it made him unco' thoughtful of his wife and bonny Inverary.'—pp. 246—248.

Or the following extract from a letter to Robert Bryanton, Esq., at Ballymahon, Ireland:—

'Sir,

'Who am I? Eh! what am I? Do you know whom you have offended? A man whose character may one of these days be mentioned with profound respect in a German comment or Dutch dictionary; whose name you will probably hear ushered in by a Doctissimus Doctissimorum, or heel-pieced with a long Latin termination. Think how Goldsmithius, or Gubblegurchius, or some such sound, as rough as a nutmeg-grater, will become me? Think of that!—° ° Sir! who am I? I must own my ill-natured cotemporaries have not hitherto paid me those honours I have had such just reason to expect. I have not yet seen my face reflected in all the lively display of red and white paints on any sign-posts in the suburbs. Your handkerchief weavers seem as yet unacquainted with my merits or physiognomy, and the very snuff-box makers appear to have forgot their respect. Tell them all from me, they are a set of Gothic, barbarous, ignorant scoundrels. There will come a day, no doubt it will—I beg you may live a couple of hundred years longer only to see the day—when the Scaligers and Daciers will vindicate my character, give learned editions of my labours, and bless the times with copious comments on the text. You shall see how they will fish up the heavy scoundrels who disregard me now, or will then offer to cavil at my productions. How will they bewail the times that suffered so much genius to lie neglected. If ever my works find their way to Tartary or China, I know the consequence. Suppose one of your Chinese Owanowitzers instructing one of your Tartarian Chianobacchi—you see I use Chinese

names to show my own erudition, as I shall soon make our Chinese talk like an Englishman to show his. This may be the subject of the lecture :—

‘ Oliver Goldsmith flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He lived to be an hundred and three years old, [and in that] age may justly be styled the sun of [literature] and the Confucius of Europe. [Many of his earlier writings, to the regret of the] learned world, were anonymous, and have probably been lost, because united with those of others. The first avowed piece the world has of his is entitled an ‘ Essay on the Present State of Taste and Literature in Europe,’—a work well worth its weight in diamonds. In this he profoundly explains what learning is, and what learning is not. In this he proves that blockheads are not men of wit, and yet that men of wit are actually blockheads.’

‘ But as I choose neither to tire my Chinese philosopher, nor you, nor myself, I must discontinue the oration, in order to give you a good pause for admiration ; and I find myself most violently disposed to admire too. Let me, then, stop my fancy to take a view of my future self ; and, as the boys say, light down to see myself on horseback.* Well, now I am down, where *is I* ? Oh, gods ! gods ! here in a garret writing for bread, and expecting to be dunned for a milk-score ! However, dear Bob, whether in penury or affluence, serious or gay, I am ever wholly thine.

‘ OLIVER GOLDSMITH.’

‘ London, Temple Exchange Coffee-house,
Temple Bar, Aug. 14, 1758.”

pp. 265—267.

Or a third extract, from a letter to Mrs. Jane Lawder :—

‘ However, it is probable you may one of those days see me turned into a perfect hunk, and as dark and intricate as a mouse-hole. I have already given my landlady orders for an entire reform in the state of my finances. I declaim against hot suppers, drink less sugar in my tea, and check my grate with brick-bats. Instead of hanging my room with pictures, I intend to adorn it with maxims of frugality. Those will make pretty furniture enough, and won't be a bit too expensive ; for I shall draw them all out with my own hands, and my landlady's daughter shall frame them with the parings of my black waistcoat. Each maxim is to be inscribed on a sheet of clean paper, and wrote with my best pen ; of which the following will serve as a specimen :—‘ Look sharp ;’ ‘ Mind the main chance ;’ ‘ Money is money now ;’ ‘ If you have a thousand pounds you can put your hands by your sides, and say you are worth a thousand pounds every day of the year ;’ ‘ Take a farthing from a hundred, and it will be a hundred no longer.’ Thus, which way soever I turn my eyes, they are sure to meet one of those friendly monitors ; and as we are told of an actor who hung his room round with looking-glasses to correct the defects of his

* A common phrase among schoolboys in Ireland now, in ridiculing an unskilful appearance of their companions on horseback.

person, my apartment shall be furnished in a peculiar manner, to correct the errors of my mind.'—p. 271.

That Goldsmith had at one time been compelled to mingle with the very dregs of society, may be inferred from the well-known fact of his once commencing a story amidst a splendid company (we believe at Sir Joshua Reynolds's) with the ominous introduction, 'When I lived amongst the beggars of Axe-lane —'

One of the most amusing expedients of poverty we have ever heard of, was that by which he endeavoured to conceal the treacherous patch in the faded 'velvet coat,' when he first entered upon his career as physician. We give the account in Mr. Prior's words.

'A ludicrous story told of him at this period afterwards reached the ears of Sir Joshua Reynolds, who repeated it to one of their mutual friends, a lady, who, to the delight of her acquaintance, can still detail the anecdote and through whom it is with much more information communicated to the reader. In conformity to the prevailing garb of the day for physicians, Goldsmith, unable probably to obtain a new, had procured a second-hand velvet coat; but either from being deceived in the bargain or by subsequent accident, a considerable breach in the left breast was obliged to be repaired by the introduction of a new piece. This had not been so neatly done, as not to be apparent to the close observation of his acquaintance, and such persons as he visited in the capacity of medical attendant: willing, therefore, to conceal what is considered too obvious a symptom of poverty, he was accustomed to place his hat over the patch, and retain it there carefully during the visit; but this constant position becoming noticed, and the cause being soon known, occasioned no little merriment at his expense.'—p. 215.

It is highly creditable to Goldsmith, and shows that his good-nature must have been exhaustless—that the unkindness of the world, and the hardships with which he had to contend, never soured his temper, never rendered him peevish or discontented, or touched his character with misanthropy. His very poverty was sometimes the subject of jest. 'All in good time, my dear boy,' said he to his brother Charles, who, having heard of Oliver's dawning fame, came to London 'to be provided for by his influential friends,' 'I shall be richer by and by; besides, you see I am not in positive want. Addison, let me tell you, wrote his poem of the Campaign in a garret in the Haymarket, three stories high; and you see I am not come to that yet, for I am only got to the *second* story.'

His benevolence was rather an instinct than a principle; for it seems never to have been in the slightest degree under the control of his reason or his judgment. He well describes himself as 'a machine of pity.' The very sight of distress seems to have

been sufficient at any time to loosen his purse-strings, without the least reflection on the worthiness of the object, on his own wants, or on the claims of his creditors. So easily was his money extracted from his pocket, and so often did his combined simplicity and benevolence render him the victim of imposition, that Mrs. Milner (the wife of the schoolmaster at Peckham, in whose establishment Goldsmith was usher) once said to him, when, as usual, he wished to forestall his salary, 'You had better, Mr. Goldsmith, let me take care of your money, as I do for some of the young gentlemen.' To which he good-naturedly replied, 'In truth, Madam, there is equal need.'

Mr. Prior has related some exquisite stories of Goldsmith's sensibility; we cannot refrain from gratifying our readers with the following:—

'While playing whist at the house of Sir William Chambers in Berner's Street, the party at the table consisting, besides Sir William, of Lady Chambers, Baretti, and Goldsmith, the latter hastily threw down his cards at a critical point of the game, flew out of the room, and, as appeared by the opening of the door, into the street, returning speedily and resuming his seat. Sir William, conceiving that something unusual had occurred, ventured, after the lapse of a few minutes, to inquire the cause of his sudden retreat, trusting it had not been occasioned by the heat of the room. 'Not at all,' was the reply, 'but in truth I could not bear to hear that unfortunate woman in the street half singing, half sobbing, for such tones could only arise from the extremity of distress; her voice grated painfully on my ear, and jarred my frame; so that I could not rest until I had sent her away.' On further explanation, it appeared that others had likewise noticed a female voice, of peculiar character, aiming to sing, but without remarking that mingled tone of misery conveyed to the mind of the poet, and which he had quitted the room to relieve.'

What a comment is this upon the life of Goldsmith; it shows not only that his heart must have been by nature most sensitive, but that he must have been deeply versed in all the forms and expressions of human misery. Nothing but this could have enabled him to understand so well and to feel so intensely the various dialects of sorrow.

Nothing could be more generous than his efforts to befriend his brother authors, especially the literary adventurers from his native land. Of these, it is said, he often had a levee at breakfast; and was familiarly, yet flatteringly styled by them, '*our doctor*.'

Though the youth of Goldsmith was dissipated, he appears, for some years before his death, to have thrown off some of his worst habits, especially that most baneful one, the habit of gaming. Johnson once said, 'Dr. Goldsmith is one of the first men we have now as an author, and he is a very worthy man too. He

'has been loose in his principles, but is *coming* right;' yet alas! one searches in vain for any satisfactory evidence of a more thorough transformation. 'I have lately finished several volumes of Johnson's Prefaces or lives of the Poets,' says Cowper, in one of his letters, 'and in all that number I observe but one man, a poet of no great fame,—of whom I did not know that he existed till I found him there,—whose mind seems to have had the slightest tincture of religion. His name was Collins; and he hardly in his senses.' We are afraid that if some second Johnson should arise to write the lives of the poets who have flourished since the period at which his work broke off, reflections somewhat similar, though happily not quite so sweeping, would naturally be suggested to the mind of the pious reader.

Of Goldsmith's intellectual and literary character, we shall speak more fully, when the new and enlarged edition of his miscellaneous works (now in course of publication, under the superintendence of Mr. Prior) shall have been submitted to our inspection. That edition is to contain a number of pieces reclaimed from the various periodicals in which Goldsmith first employed his pen, and which he did not think it worth while to own. That nothing will be inserted for the authenticity of which Mr. Prior will not adduce sufficient evidence, we are quite willing to believe; the extent and accuracy of his research are a sufficient guarantee on this point; we confess, however, that on another point, our confidence is not quite so plenary. We do hope that he will not insert any thing merely *because* it came from Goldsmith, or unless it is in some measure worthy of his reputation. There is no great author who has not written many slight things, to which he would be very sorry to see his name attached. We are induced to make this observation, because Mr. Prior has, in one place, expressed what we cannot but think latitudinarian views upon this subject.

We must not close these articles without making one or two observations on Mr. Prior's style. We frankly acknowledge that we have derived so much amusement from his volumes, that we would willingly have passed this topic by unnoticed: but critical justice, and even our solicitude for Mr. Prior's *second edition*, forbid. We hardly ever met with a writer, whose acquaintance with the best portion of English literature was so extensive and so accurate, who appeared to possess so slight a perception of the elegancies of composition, or who had caught so little of the spirit of his models.

Gross grammatical errors, though his work contains such, we will not charge upon him, because we are convinced that they can have crept in only by haste or negligence. In many instances, however, the turn and structure of the sentences is so awkward and clumsy as to render the meaning almost unintelligible,

or to convey, when syntactically analyzed, a meaning as different as possible from the real one. What, for example, are we to think of such sentences as the following?

‘Telling tales is to others a profession; who travel the country in default of more steady modes of industry, and find refreshment and a ready audience in farm-houses to hear such wonders as they have gleaned from memory or by invention.’

‘A friend had furnished him with a guinea; and the desire, perhaps, of spending it in (to a school-boy) the most independent manner at an inn,’ &c.

‘Communicated by a grand niece of the poet, who became, by marriage, singularly enough, connected with the unfortunate tutor, to the Rev. John Graham.’

He means, we presume, ‘communicated to the Rev. John Graham,’ &c.

‘After entering France, his music *became* again in requisition.’

Speaking of those who re-published, without acknowledgment, some of Goldsmith’s earlier pieces, Mr. Prior says,—

‘Commonly the obligation was not only not acknowledged, but besides being for the moment deprived of the honors of originality, the popularity of his past labours were occasionally made to counterbalance the weight of those that occupied him at the moment.’

‘Among the alleged papers of Nash, were found a letter wretchedly spelt, said to be written by Quin to a nobleman, soliciting his assistance in the design of supplanting the master of the ceremonies in his situation, which letter, through some means, had been communicated to the object of the supposed plot by being found in his possession.’

‘One of the scenes, whither he was led for occasional amusement, more perhaps than it was voluntarily sought, was the well-known debating society of the Robin Hood, &c.’

We trust Mr. Prior will not be offended with the above remarks; we sincerely thank him for the entertainment he has afforded us, and cordially recommend his volumes to the attention of our readers.

-
- Art. III. 1. *Report addressed by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries to its British and American Members.* pp. xvi. 188. With numerous Engravings on Wood and Copper. Copenhagen, 1836.
2. *Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord à Copenhague. Séance Annuelle tenue le 31 Janvier, 1835.*
3. *Même Société. Séance Annuelle du 30 Janvier, 1836.*
4. *Antiquitates Britannicæ et Hibernicæ; or, a Collection of Accounts elucidating the Earlier History of Great Britain and Ireland; extracted from Ancient Icelandic and Scandinavian MSS., and other*

historical sources ; with a Latin Translation, Geographical and Archæological Notes, Fac-similes, and Maps. Edited by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries. [Prospectus.] Copenhagen, 1836.

‘**D**AN AND ANGUL, says our venerable historian, Saxo-Grammaticus, WERE BROTHERS ;’ and with this appropriate but quaint citation does the Danish Society, whose researches are described in the works above enumerated introduce the Report addressed to its British and American members. The expression, they observe, was doubtless borrowed ‘from a current popular tradition, ‘which again may have been founded on some still more ancient ‘legendary lay ;’ and is probably ‘but a figurative statement of ‘the fact, that the Danish and English people are originally ‘descended from the same ancestry.’ ‘This fact which,’ they continue,

‘as is well known, is laid down by the old historians of England, receives familiar confirmation from the circumstance, that Angeln, whence the Angles, who gave their name [*Anglia*] to England, emigrated, lies within the limits of Denmark Proper ; and that the Jutes, or Jotes, *Jutæ*,—whose collateral descendants, under the name of Jutlanders, still inhabit a portion of Continental Denmark,—were, with the Angles and Saxons, one of the confederate tribes that, on the abandonment of Britain by the Romans, migrated thither, and contributed to form the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy.’—Report, p. iii., Introduction.

This, which with one exception, is an accurate representation of facts, certainly goes some way towards the evidence of a common origin of the two nations. The exception we take is to the *obiter dictum* whereby the state of things which followed the separate inroads of the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles, is designated as the Saxon Heptarchy ; an erroneous term, which however familiar by usage, must, as Sir Francis Palgrave has observed, in strict propriety ‘be rejected, because an idea is conveyed thereby, ‘which is substantially wrong. At no period of our history,’ as he truly says, ‘were there ever *seven* kingdoms independent of ‘each other ; and, if we include those kingdoms which were subservient to larger states, the number must be increased.’ With this exception, however, which is merely by the way, the facts may be admitted as stated, and they certainly show that the Angles were Danes. Still this evidence scarcely covers the whole case, for the former, though so fortunate as to attach their name to nearly the whole of South Britain, formed but a small portion of the adventurers who at different times obtained a footing in the country ; and, though the Jutes, who laid the first foundations of Danish settlement in England, should also be acknowledged as the progeny of the mythic DAN, the relationship of the Saxons, who successively established the king-

doms of Sussex, Wessex, and Essex, remains yet unproved. Of this, however, which is in fact no doubtful point, the Society furnish some very interesting evidence, or rather set it, for the information is not new, in an interesting light; and, before offering some remarks upon the general question of the remoter sources whence the British Islands were first peopled, we will lay before our readers some additional extracts on this subject, from the Introduction to the Report, which stands at the head of the present article. Having observed that the many writings in the Anglo-Saxon language which have reached us, 'plainly show' that it constituted an important link between the old Teutonic and the old Northern, which anciently was spoken in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden,' they proceed to notice the following mythological and other analogies:—

'The heathen ancestors of the Angles, of the Saxons, and of the Scandinavians had *the same religion*; their common deities, Tyr, Wodan, Thur, Frea, etc., still survive, and are daily suggested to memory, in the ordinary appellations of the days of the week common to both the leading races. The same mythic beings, Gudh, Gud, Godh; Alfar, Ælfs, Ylfe, Elves; Vætter, Vihte, Wights; Dvergar, Dveorh, Dveorgs, Dwarfs; Jöttnar, Jætter, Jotnas, Eotnas; Tröll, Trolde, Trolles; Thursar, Thurser, Thyrs; Hel, Hell, etc. were worshipped or feared, in their times of paganism, by both Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians, and occur not only in their ancient poetical remains and other writings, but also in the language, the popular superstitions, traditions, and ballads of their still flourishing posterity. As both these leading races called their oldest progenitor (and also the first man) Ask or Æsc, so they likewise traced the family of their kings and princes to a common progenitor of divine lineage, Voda, Vodan, Voden, Oden, Odin, and likewise panegyrised in their poems the very same heroes: for example, Volund (Veland); Volse, (Vælse) Volsung; Giuke (Givica); Sigmund; Skiold (Scyld); Halfdan, Healfdene; Ubbe, Uffo, Offa; Vermund (Veremund); Jormunrek, Eormenric; Hrodulf (Hrolf, Rolf); Helge (Halga) etc., and likewise the very same races of princes or people, for instance, Skioldungs (Scyldings), Skylfings; Ylfings (Wylfings) etc.

'The *Lays* of the Anglo-Saxons and of the inhabitants of the North are constructed according to the very same metrical rules, with alliterative verse, and employ the same poetical language, all which evidently shows that not only the Lays, but also the people of whom they are the remains, sprang from one and the same root. We have, however, scarcely any Anglo-Saxon poem of the heathen time that is purely pagan. The influence of Christianity is to be discerned in most of them; and therefore we cannot sufficiently regret that some very ancient Anglo-Saxon writings, containing chiefly prayers, invocations, and religious rites in honour of the heathen deities, and particularly of the Sun and Woden, which were discovered A.D. 890, in the ruins of a palace or temple, in the centre of the city of Verlamacester or Verlingacester (formerly Verolamium) were at the same time burned by

command of a fanatic abbot. Fortunately something of the same kind has been saved in the remote north, in the two Eddas preserved in Iceland: these, as well as some other old northern poems, and their poetical diction, elucidate, in the clearest manner, most of the obscure passages and phrases that occur in the ancient lays of the Anglo-Saxons, as these lays, on the other hand, afford important means for the explanation of similar old northern relics. The same remark may be made with respect to the eldest *laws* of both the Anglo-Saxons and the inhabitants of the north, which mutually elucidate and explain each other. Along with the ancient language, the ancient law maintained itself longest in Iceland, where it is still, to a certain degree, the law of the land; and therefore it is easy to explain the striking phenomenon, that certain Icelandic legal terms and phrases give the best explanation of several obscure terms that are still in use in the English laws.

This remark holds good, in a still higher degree, with regard to the *dialect* of the common people of England, particularly in the northern and eastern districts; for to the greater part of the peculiar words and expressions there occurring, complete counterparts can be shown either in the old northern and Icelandic, or even in the modern Danish, low German, Southjutlandish, or Swedish. Some of the English idioms are to be recognised in the old ballads, but these ballads again correspond, in very many respects, with the ancient Danish, Swedish, low Saxon and Icelandic popular songs of the same kind, which can be proved to be of a very remote antiquity both in Denmark and Iceland. In like manner the very same *proverbs*—partly preserving the old alliteration—still live, as palpable relics of paganism, in the colloquial dialect of the common people of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Britain, and Iceland, and the same remark may be applied to the *popular manners, customs, diversions, superstitions*, etc. of these nations.—Report, pp. iv. v., Introduction.

It may not be altogether uninteresting to our readers if we now state, with some attention to order, a few of the traditions which have come down to us respecting the earlier population of Great Britain and Ireland; and we shall give precedence to the sister island, as being the subject of some of the oldest traditions of remote ages. The various streams of population which in different periods of antiquity have flowed in a westward or north-westward direction from the cradle of the human race, are now, with almost the universal consent of the learned, distributed into five races—the Iberian, the Celtic, the Teutonic, the Slavonian, and the Finnish.* These probably set out on their wanderings nearly in the order in which they are here stated, the earlier migrations being pressed and driven further westward by those of later date. The honour of first reaching Ireland is still debated between the Iberian and the Celtic races; the earliest traditions

* Some consider these races as aborigines, *autochthones*, but this does not affect the distribution of them, which, as decided by identity of language and customs, remains as we have stated it.

being very doubtful, and indeed inconsistent with each other, unless we concede the priority in point of time of the Iberian traditions. Nor is the difficulty much diminished by an investigation of the Irish language, for while W. Von Humboldt has decided that it is totally distinguished from the Iberian, which, of all the European dialects, has been considered to possess the nearest resemblance to the Semitic and Indian families of language; others have observed that it is almost equally remote from those which are usually received as Celtic. On this account Professor Mone, of Heidelberg, in his *Geschichte des Heidenthums im nördlichen Europa*, following in the steps of Adelung, in his *Mithridates*, considers it as a distinct dialect between the Iberian and the Cimbric, and, judging on philological principles alone, both Adelung and he regard the Irish, not only as Celts, but as, with their Scottish off-sets, the only pure Celts, and the Britons as a people of Celtic origin, adulterated by a migration from the Teutonic race of the Cimbri or Belgæ. This view certainly receives some countenance from the designation 'Cymri,' retained by the modern Welsh, and we think the philological argument entitled to attention; but Dr. Mone himself acknowledges that the testimony whereby the Irish might support their national traditions in favour of an Iberian origin are unknown to him; and adds, with a consideration worthy of his learning: 'it may very well be, that from the resources of their ancient poetry, testimonies very important in this respect might be produced, whereby the German view, which refers the whole case to philological decision, would in many respects be materially altered.' Durst we interfere in a strife so weighty and so obscure, we should certainly declare ourselves in favour of the Iberian origin, which has not only the support of Tacitus, but of other authorities; the '*Historia Brittonum*,' of Nennius, for instance, who wrote in the sixth century, and who expressly says (p. 52 of the London edition, published in 1820) '*Sic mihi periti Scottorum nunciaverunt.*' The same author also asserts (p. 54. of the same work) that he has taken the genealogies of the Teutonic races, '*ex antiquis libris nostrorum veterum*;' and adds, '*hanc peritiam didicimus ex traditione veterum.*' Such an authority, as Mone justly observes, is not to be rejected; and our readers, we take for granted, are aware the *Scoti*, or *Scotti*, whom he mentions, denote the Irish, from whom the designation passed to the modern Scotch, by means of their numerous descents in the west of Scotland.* The matter must, however, be considered as still *sub judice*, though there appears to us nothing more difficult in

* It is curious enough to observe that, according to the testimony of Nyniaw (the Nennius above mentioned), the designation of the Scots did not originate in Ireland. This old historian speaks of three migrations of the *Scots* into Ireland out of Spain.

the supposition that in Ireland the first imported Iberian dialect should be obliterated by repeated Celtic invasions, than in the fact that in England the pure or corrupt Celtic of the Welsh, be it which it may, has been entirely displaced by the victorious incursions of the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles. The cases are parallel in every particular.

As to Britain meanwhile, the first lifting of the veil in the pages of established history discovers the south, south-western, and middle parts of what is now called England in the possession of the ancient Britons, a people of Celtic origin, who had come over from Gaul; and the northern and western coasts of the same country in the occupation of the Belgæ of Teutonic origin. For this we have the testimony of Julius Cæsar. Before this discovery, however, and, for aught that we can tell, at no long interval after the arrival of the Britons in the south, the extreme north and north-eastern parts of the island were entered by the Scandinavian or northern branch of the Teutonic race. These settlers are the Picts of British history,* and their settlement, which supposes the prior occupation of Ireland by the Celts, was probably soon followed by the migrations, to which we have already referred, of the Celtic Irish to the western coasts of Scotland. Upon the question of the pure or mixed character of the Celtic population of Britain, it is only right to adduce, in opposition to the view proposed by Adelung, the statements of Dr. Pritchard, one of the most distinguished critical investigators of Celtic literature in our own or any other country. This eminent writer, in his work on the eastern origin of the Celtic nations, most distinctly states (p. 20) that 'Adelung, who has been followed in this particular by many foreign writers, has committed the error of supposing the Welsh tongue to be descendant from the language of the Belgæ, and not from that of the Celtæ, who inhabited the central parts of Gaul, and, as it is generally supposed, of Britain.' He then adds, in explanation of this error, 'a want of access to information respecting the Celtic dialects, has prevented the learned men of Germany from forming

* On this point we find in the Introduction to the Danish Society's Report the following interesting confirmation from both Scandinavian and Celtic sources: 'Agreeably to the most ancient heroic poems of the Scottish Highlanders (in elucidating which much light is to be obtained from northern sources) the attacks of the northmen on Scotland, before they got a firm footing there, were chiefly made from the Orkneys, which from time immemorial seem to have been inhabited by people of Scandinavian origin. Dr. John Jamieson's masterly philological investigations have proved, that the ancient Lowland Scotch—and, generally speaking, the colloquial dialect of Scotland—is more frequently to be traced to Northern than to Anglo-Saxon sources. Mr. Robert Jamieson has proved a similar result, in respect to the remarkable affinity, both of language and poetry, which prevails between the Scottish and Danish ballads.—Report, p. vi., Introduction.

‘correct opinions on their relations to each other; and hence it has arisen that this department in the history of languages—a subject which has been principally investigated by German writers—still remains but imperfectly elucidated.’

We have thus endeavoured to give a summary view of the various sources whence the British Islands were peopled before the Roman invasion; the inroads of the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles were consequent on their abandonment of Britain. The Report before us opens several interesting hints respecting the subsequent intercourse maintained between the British Islands and the countries peopled by the Scandinavian and Teutonic tribes, of which some appear to supply very valuable materials of historical investigation. The relationship of Dan to Angul, therefore, may be considered to be of very great advantage to such modern Britons as are disposed to carry their researches into the primitive history of their beloved Fatherland up to the investigation of the earliest legendary and historical sources; and, on this account, we acknowledge that we hail the appearance of this Danish Report with decided satisfaction. It is true that it is not published in the full sense of the term, but merely printed for distribution among the English and American members of the Society of Northern Antiquaries; but, as among these, it will be probable that some of our most indefatigable British antiquaries will from time to time be numbered, we hope that the hints thus communicated to them will not be altogether lost to the public. To us it is perfectly evident, from the perusal of the papers we have seen, that the celebrated library of Copenhagen, which, in addition to its 400,000 printed volumes, comprises 20,000 MSS., many of them illustrative of northern history, places at the disposal of the literati of the Society the means of throwing much additional light over the history of Great Britain and Ireland. Indeed, as we have already said, the Report before us contains many interesting glimpses of such light. We believe that the following representation of the progress of Christianity northward will be regarded as an instance of the kind:—

‘The greatest and most important reaction which the inhabitants of Britain exerted on the north, was that which manifested itself at the introduction or diffusion of Christianity, in the countries inhabited by natives of Scandinavian origin. Anglo-Saxon missionaries converted a great portion of the continental Saxons and of the Frisians, and, to the best of our knowledge, it was they who first scattered abroad the seeds of Christianity among the Danes. It is true, the Germans have the merit of Denmark’s first formal transition to Christianity, but its general diffusion among the people, must, without doubt, be ascribed to that intimate acquaintance with its nature and institutions, which the Danes, chiefly during the reign of Canute the Great, acquired by means of their dominion and sojourn in England. On this occasion

many British missionaries, monks, priests, and prelates, came to Denmark, and laboured faithfully in their vocation, not confining their exertions to that country alone, but occasionally extending them over the whole Scandinavian north. Next to Canute, the Englishman William (who was first his chancellor and chaplain, but afterwards, in the reign of his nephew Swein, Bishop of Roeskilde) may be said to have taken the lead in conducting the great work. Swein governed the kingdom, and William the church, during the entire period of thirty years, and both died, nearly on the same day, in the year 1074. The Cathedral of Roeskilde, to this day one of Denmark's noblest architectural ornaments, was first built by them, though not entirely completed until a succeeding age. It was from *England* that Norway received the first germ of Christianity. It was *there* that Hacon, the first Christian king of Norway, commenced and finished his education, during the period from 937 to 963, though he failed in his effort to establish his own faith among his subjects. His brother Eric also, whom he had driven from the throne, embraced the Christian faith, and died as ruler of Northumberland, about 952. It was reserved for the insignificant islets of Scilly to kindle for Norway that light which was thence to be diffused over the remotest north. The expatriated Norwegian prince and sea-king, Olaf Tryggvason, known in the history of England by the name of Anlaf, received baptism in these isles A.D. 993; three years after that he overran all Norway, and in four more, or precisely at the completion of the first millennium after the birth of Christ, he introduced Christianity not only there, but also in Iceland, where, however, some British and Irish Christians had previously lived and labored; he also introduced it into the Färö Isles and into the remote Greenland. From England Olaf took along with him, in addition to other clergymen, his chief court priest and Bishop, Sigvard or Sigurd (also called Sigfred, and John, or Johannes), who not only contributed much to the conversion of Norway, but also of Sweden. For as early as the year 1000, he converted and baptized his sovereign's brother-in-law, Rognvald Ulfson, the ruler of West Gothland, and subsequently, after the death of Olaf Tryggvason, he converted Olaf Ericson, king of Sweden, about the year 1008, and at that period and afterwards many other Swedes. The Bishop Grimkel (or Grimketel) who, along with King Olaf Haraldson (deceased A.D. 1030) completed the conversion of Norway, and promulgated the first ecclesiastical law for it and for Iceland, was Sigurd's nephew and also an Englishman.'—Report, pp. viii. ix., Introduction.

Without entering with too severe a scrutiny into the character of the Christianity thus disseminated, it must at least be admitted to be a much better religion than the Scandinavian paganism; and to us, as Englishmen, it is, we must acknowledge, matter of devout thankfulness to God, that in those early as well as in these more recent times, he has permitted our favoured land to send forth the light of his most precious Gospel.

The methods whereby the Society pursues its principal object of illustrating the history of the northern nations, may be, in a

measure, judged of from the contents of the Report to which we have already referred, and from the introduction to which we have selected the preceding extracts. This comprises:—

- ‘ I. A brief exposition of the oldest Icelandic and Norwegian accounts of Ireland. By Professor N. M. Petersen. pp. 1—17.
- ‘ II. An Essay on the Stone Implements of the Pagan Northmen. pp. 18—39.
- ‘ III. The Runamo Inscription. pp. 39—48.
- ‘ IV. Account of some Bronze Antiquities found in the island of Fyen. pp. 48—53.
- ‘ V. A remarkable Bronze Axe-hammer. pp. 53, 54.
- ‘ VI. Valuable Collection of Gold Antiquities found in Fyen. pp. 54—59.
- ‘ VII. Northern Gold Ornaments from the Pagan times. pp. 59—60.
- ‘ VIII. Account of some Scandinavian Chessmen. pp. 60—81.
- ‘ IX. A Dissertation on the Ruthwell Obelisk, and the Anglo-Saxon Runes. By Professor Finn Magnuson.* pp. 81—188.

Engravings, exceedingly well executed in copper, are given of the implements in stone and bronze, as well as of the golden ornaments and chessmen. The article on the last-mentioned curiosities is professedly designed as a supplement to ‘ the very ‘ erudite and interesting description of them by Sir Frederick ‘ Madden, in the 24th volume of the *ARCHÆOLOGIA*, published ‘ by the Antiquarian Society of London.’ We must allow ourselves one extract from this curious and amusing paper, in illustration of the light which such discoveries, unimportant as they may seem to some, are adapted to shed upon the intercourse of ancient nations.

‘ Those versed in Scandinavian history need no ulterior proof of the game of chess having been known in Europe prior to the time of the crusades, instead of being brought thither as some of the old French writers have asserted, after that epoch; and for those who are not thus familiar with the history of the north, it would be still a work of supererogation here to adduce the many evidences to that fact that are to be gleaned from the Sagas, this having been already so ably done by Sir Fredk. Madden (*l. c.*). We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to citing but one more conclusive testimony to the same effect, testimony furnished by a fact recorded in a yet unpublished portion of the celebrated Norwegian historian, Gerhard Schönning’s account of his travels. That writer states, to wit, that ‘ in a barrow at Vestrerömen, at Hedemark, in the now diocese of Christiania, has been found a complete

* We are informed, in a note to this table, that, from p. 1 to 138, the Report was translated from the Danish by the late G. G. Macdougall, Esq., and the remainder by John M’Caul, Esq., M. A., Oxon., both members of the Society.

set of chess-men, wrapt up in a piece of silken stuff almost rotten, which are said to have been transmitted to the royal museum of arts in the year 1730.' The silken stuff, we may safely take for granted, was, at the remote period here referred to, brought from the East, *via* the Byzantine empire, or Russia—and perhaps the chess-men too came with it.

'We cannot enter here on an investigation of the opinions entertained by various antiquaries, as to whether the game of chess is of Chinese, Indian, Persian, Arabian, Egyptian, or Byzantine origin. What we have in view at present is the single point, that it was in use and vogue in Scandinavia in the heathen times. For the rest, the men underwent various changes, in respect both of form and name, subsequently to the Christian era, a circumstance to be ascribed to the Northmen's then more frequent intercourse with strangers, as well as, more especially, to their making it a branch of industry, after their discovery and colonization of Greenland, to manufacture chess-men of walrus-tusks, with a view to sending them abroad as presents, or for the purposes of traffic, and the obligation this imposed on them to give them the forms that happened to be most in use in the foreign countries with which they thus had intercourse.'—Report, pp. 68, 69.

The piece of silk referred to, in which the chessmen were tied up, would seem to be the *Tafspíngur*, a bag which was used, not only to keep the men, but probably also for playing the game. This at least is the use to which it both has been and still is applied by the Arabs, who wrap up their men in a piece of stuff made of differently coloured patches, so as to be capable of serving as a board or table.

The golden ornaments, which are described and figured, are historically valuable, principally as they illustrate the connexion of the Scandinavian pagans with the Roman empire. Such connexions between the empire and uncivilized nations have been too often overlooked, and seem even to have been unsuspected by some very distinguished historians, although of such importance, that Sir Francis Palgrave, 'after having long investigated the subject,' has expressed his opinion, 'that there is no possible mode of exhibiting the states of western Christendom in their true aspect, unless we consider them as arising out of the dominion of the Casars.' Now, though the Scandinavian nations, which remained unsubdued, do not fall under precisely the same category as these western states, yet it must be obvious to every student of history, that the investigation of the nature and extent of such intercourse is of very great moment, when once the existence of it has been ascertained. In this respect these ornaments must be considered highly valuable. They also offer probable evidence as to the time when the use of coined money began to supersede the weighing out or cutting off of pieces of precious metal for payments in the north.

The stone implements discovered principally consist of whet-

stones—flat, clubformed, or rounded off at the ends; quoins—without heads, cuniform at both ends, or square—round, or sharp-headed; chisels and gouges of different shapes and sizes; knives or lance heads of flint or hornstone; flint crescents; flint-flakes and arrow heads—trilateral, lanceolate, or heart shaped; arrow heads of bone, with bits of flint let in along their edges; axes and axe-hammers—square backed, bulge headed, boat-shaped, or knob-headed, with pendulous edge; hammers of different forms; and slings, shuttle-stones, dirks, anchors, corn-crushers, touch-stones, &c. &c. These, and the bronze antiquities, some of which are perfectly unique, give considerable insight into Scandinavian customs. But we must for a moment leave the Report before us, in order to extract from the account of the Society's Annual Meeting for 1835, a short description of one of the Society's investigations. This extract will convey an idea of the methods by which antique remains are occasionally brought to light, along with the credentials of their progressive antiquity.

'In clearing the fountain of St. John, at Roeskilde, from the mud and filth which had collected for several centuries, and had risen to the height of twenty feet, a quantity of objects have been discovered, which had been successively lost, and which evidently belong to very different periods. They are principally vessels of clay, frequently of unknown forms, and vessels of copper and bronze. The objects found in the upper layers are almost modern; among these there is the lid of a coffee-pot; but, as the investigation got nearer to the bottom, the forms and materials of the objects varied more and more, until it was evident that those last discovered were relics of Pagan times. Bronze vessels, for instance, were discovered, similar in form and material to those of the sacred cups of those ages; and clay vessels similar to the pagan urns. A bone comb was also found, made exactly like those which are dug up in the pagan *tumuli*.'

Séance Annuelle, 1835, p. 4.

Of all the articles comprised in the Report, however, the most interesting, are unquestionably Professor Petersen's Exposition of the oldest Icelandic and Norwegian Accounts of Ireland, illustrated by a very beautiful, though minute map, representing its earliest divisions, and the two by Professor Finn Magnuson on the Runamo Inscription, and the Ruthwell Obelisk. The history of interpretation is perhaps as curiously illustrated by the fate of the inscription just mentioned, as by any specimen which can be adduced. Our readers will excuse the length of the following extract relating to it, as well for the lessons it suggests, as the information which it conveys.

'This inscription, cut in the surface of a flat rock at a place called Hoby, between Carlshamn and Runamo, in Bleking, a province now of Sweden, but formerly of Denmark, is the most celebrated, and, to the best of our knowledge, the oldest monument of the kind in all

the North, though, in as far as regards its contents, that of which least has hitherto been known. Mention was first made of it by Saxo Grammaticus, who, in the preface to his *Historia Danica*, speaks of the rock in question as an *apta meantibus rupes, mirandis literarum notis interstincla*, and states that king Waldemar the First (or the Great, who was contemporary with him, and whose reign extended from 1157 to 1182), sent some emissaries thither, skilled in Runic lore, for the purpose of reading the inscription, and cutting a facsimile of it on some small wooden sticks (*virgulis quibusdam*), as also that these men returned without having accomplished the object of their mission, reporting that they had found the characters of the inscription (or the surface of the rock in which it was cut), partly so much worn away by frequent passage of pedestrians over it, and partly so much filled up with soil, that it was impossible for them to make it out. It is apparent hence that the inscription had sustained such injury as to have become in part illegible, as early as the twelfth century, if not still earlier; though this, in all probability, was not so much the result of frequent passage over it by pedestrians, as Saxo intimates, or of its exposure to the air and weather, as the work of human hands. For 500 years after this mission of king Waldemar's, no farther attempt to decipher the inscription appears to have been made. At length, the celebrated antiquary, Ole Worm (Olaus Wormius), who was then engaged in collecting the materials for his great work, the *Monumenta Danica*, sent his amanuensis to the spot, about 1640, with a like intent. No better fortune, however, attended him than had crowned the efforts of his predecessors, and even the drawing furnished by him of the rock (vid. *Mon. Dan.*) served but to give a very false idea of its aspect. The ill success, meanwhile, of Worm, did not discourage later antiquaries from following his example, and Runamo was visited, accordingly, by Biörner about 1720, Müttzell in 1747, Langebek and Abildgaard in 1753, Hilfeling in 1777, Sjöborg in 1792, and others, none of whom, however, were fortunate enough to throw any light upon the subject. At length, in 1805, it was visited by the celebrated M. F. Arendt, of Altona, an antiquary, the fame of whose pilgrimages on foot, to many other like monuments of antiquity, is known throughout all Europe, and who, on inspection of the one in question, declared that the much talked of inscription was in reality nothing more than a *lusus naturæ*, the marks which had been taken to be artificial characters being merely accidental fissures and scratches in the rock. From that date, the opinion of Arendt became the prevailing one, while the very few who inclined to entertain a different view of the subject, came to the conclusion, that all hope of ever deciphering the remains of what they still considered the inscription, was vain. Things remained in this state till it occurred to the late Bishop of Zealand, Dr. P. E. Müller, who purposed publishing a new edition of Saxo, to have this interesting monument once more investigated, and, with this view, to ask the co-operation of the Royal Society of Sciences, which learned body, entering with ardour into his views, deputed three of its members, Professors Molbech, Magnuson, and Forchhammer, to repair to Bleking for the purpose.

These gentlemen, accordingly, in execution of the trust confided to them, carefully examined, on the 14th and 15th of July, 1833, the rock in question, which they found to be a flat mass of granite-gneiss, intersected by a vein of Whinstone, (or black Trapp) in which the marks adverted to occur—as well as these marks themselves, which they decided to be veritable characters produced by artificial means, though blended here and there with accidental cracks and fissures that, at first view, seemed not unlike, but on closer investigation were clearly distinguishable from them. The artist who had accompanied the commission from Copenhagen, made an accurate drawing of the whole vein of whinstone (which was formerly regarded by some persons as artificial, and as intended to represent the figure of a snake) and of the characters traced upon it, characters which were perceived at once to be Runes, though it was found impossible to decipher them upon the spot. Having so far succeeded in the object of their excursion, the commissioners returned to Copenhagen, and Professor Magnuson, on whom especially devolved the charge of interpreting, if possible, the inscription, applied himself to the task. Notwithstanding his utmost efforts, however, a period of ten months elapsed during which he made no progress towards its accomplishment, and it is impossible to say how long its completion might have been delayed, had it not fortunately occurred to him, on the 22nd of May, 1834, to attempt reading the inscription backwards, that is from right to left, instead of in the usual way from left to right, upon which he made out at once, with perfect ease, the first word of it, and in less than two hours' time the whole. The inscription was found to be in the Old-northern, or, as it is now called, the Icelandic tongue, and (as much of it as had survived the ravages of time) in regular alliterative verse of the sort called *Fornyrðhalag* or *Starkadharlag*—from the circumstance of Starkadur, or Stærkodder the Old, being held to have composed in that measure a poem of which Saxo has given some extracts, on the battle of Braavalle, shortly previous to which battle it must have been that the inscription here in question was cut in the rock at Runamo.—Report, pp. 39—43.

Our readers will now doubtless be interested to read the inscription itself, as it is rendered by Professor Magnuson.

‘HILDEKIN RECEIVED [inherited] THE KINGDOM

‘GARD HEWED OUT. [these characters].

‘OLE TOOK THE OATH [of fealty to Hildekin]

‘ODIN CONSECRATE THESE RUNES!

‘MAY RING GET

‘A FALL ON THE MOULD!

‘ELVES GODS OF FIDELITY

‘OLE HATE.

‘ODIN AND FREY

‘AND THE ASER-RACE

‘DESTROY—DESTROY

‘OUR ENEMIES!

‘GRANT TO HARALD

‘A GREAT VICTORY!’—Report, p. 44.

From the explanation given of this inscription by the Professor, we learn that all the persons whose names are mentioned in it, except Odin, who is invoked to impart a magic power to it; the fabulous Elves and Aser-race, who were the divinities presiding over friendship and fidelity, and the goddess Freya, are historical personages. Hildekin himself, better known as Harald Hildetand, king of Denmark,

‘Is recorded to have been a great conqueror, having united to his hereditary states the country of the Vends, or Vandals; a part of Germany, or the Netherlands along the Rhine; as well as a part of England, i. e. Northumberland, and Cumberland. It is however probable, that his dominion over the latter was confined to an annual descent upon its coasts in summer, in company with the Picts and Britons, and the exaction of a tribute like that afterwards levied in England under the name of *Danegeld*, in acknowledgment of his sovereignty.’ *

Report, p. 43.

The ‘Ring’ of this inscription is Ringo, (called in the Icelandic Chronicles Sigurdhr Ríng, or Hringr,) king of Sweden, who disputed with him the crown of Denmark. The ‘Gard’ (Gardhr),

‘who is stated to have cut this inscription in the rock, is also an historical personage, being spoken of by Saxo, as well as in the Saga above referred to, as one of Harald’s scalds and warriors. He bears testimony to the fact of Harald’s right to the kingdom disputed him by Ring. We learn in like manner from the same sources, that the *Uli* or *Oli* (called by Saxo, *Olo*,) likewise mentioned in it, was a nephew (sister’s son) of Harald, who, after having served him in the capacity of admiral of his fleet, forsook him and entered into the service of his opponent, Ring. His perjury is distinctly mentioned in the inscription, and the gods presiding over truth and friendship are implored to abandon him, as being a traitor.

The Saga before adverted to, expressly states that the army of Harald was seven days on its way to the appointed field of battle in East Gothland, in proceeding to which it must have passed close by, or at least not far from, Runamo.’—Report, pp. 45, 46.

* ‘The chief sources,’ says Professor Magnuson, ‘from which our information concerning the life and career of Harald is derived, are Saxo’s *British History*, and the fragment of a Saga, the rest of which is unfortunately lost, of the Pagan kings of Denmark and of Sweden, commonly called *Sögubrot* (published by Professor Rafn, from an original MS. in the *Fornaldar Sögur Nordhrlanda*. I. 361—388); both of which authorities not only reflect light upon, and serve to confirm each other, but satisfactorily prove the authenticity of the inscription here in question.’—Report, pp. 43, 44.

The battle of Bravalle itself, the 'most famous battle of Scandinavian antiquity,' as it has been termed, was probably fought between the rival kings towards the close of the seventh, or beginning of the eighth century; some historians assigning to it as early a date as the year 680, others assigning it to the year 730 or 735. 'Warriors from all parts of the North—Northmen, Saxons, Livonians, Russians, Anglo-Saxons, Frisians, Erse—participated in it as auxiliaries.' It only remains to mention, that the inscription was one of the last works of the faithful Gard; he, as well as his beloved master, finding his death upon the field of battle.

We must deny ourselves the gratification of giving any extracts from the article on the Ruthwell Obelisk, though the most elaborate dissertation in the whole Report, and though the monument itself contains probably the oldest Runic inscription in Britain. It comprises, besides an historical account of the Obelisk, a copious alphabet of Anglo-Saxon Runes; a lengthened and careful analysis of the inscription; a discussion on the language in which it is written—which Professor Magnuson considers 'to be a 'confused compound of Old Northern, Old Saxon, (subsequently called Low Saxon, or Low German,) Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, and Belgic'—and an historical explanation of its contents. Whatever may be thought of the decyphering of the inscription, the historical detail which follows, must be admitted to possess great value. On comparing the results of Professor Magnuson's investigations, however, with those of Mr. Repp and others, we must acknowledge ourselves to have been reminded of the great obscurity in which these Runic inscriptions are enveloped. Some of our readers will probably remember the fate of that for instance, in the church of Bridekirk, in Cumberland, which, after being rendered by Olaus Wormius: '*Harold made this heap, and raised these stones, in honour of his mother and of Mabrok*;' by Bishop Nicholson: '*Here Eckard was converted, and to this man's example were the Danes brought*;' and by Mr. Hamper, (in the nineteenth volume of the *Archæologia*): '*Richard he me wrought, and to this form me diligently brought*;' has since been obligingly clothed with another version by our Danish friends themselves.

What we have already given, will perhaps be considered a sufficient indication of the Society's labours in the discovery and investigation of antiquities, whether monumental or existing in the form of utensils, ornaments, or weapons. On this part of the subject it merely remains to add one observation on the mutual relation of these Scandinavian and British relics.

'The Scandinavian antiquities, whether belonging to the ancient heathen period, or the earliest Christian times, bear,' it is said, 'so great a resemblance to those of Britain and Ireland, that when accu-

ately examined and described, they mutually explain and elucidate each other. This is especially the case with the pagan stone-circles, stone-altars, barrows, &c. The most ancient of such British erections are generally ascribed to the Druids, but it is very possible that these sages of the olden time had more in common with the Drotts, or Drotts, of the North, than a mere similarity of name, or than the rearing of such monuments. The stone erections in the Scottish, Orkney, and Shetland Isles, show themselves to be purely Northern, or reared by people of decidedly Northern extraction. Those still remaining in these islands are particularly well described and explained by Dr. Hibbert.—Report, pp. ix. x, Introduction.

Besides what we have already mentioned, the Society, as we find from their yearly reports, published in French, of which two are named at the head of this article, is engaged in a great number of important geographical and other investigations, and in the republication of some of the most valuable literary remains of Northern antiquity; some of which have remained hitherto unpublished, others have appeared, but in a very inaccurate manner. In pursuance of the former object, the Greenland district of Julianehaab, and the coasts of Davis's Straits, have, since 1832, been repeatedly searched for antiquities, principally with a view to determine with all possible certainty, the position of the ancient European colony denominated *Eystribyggdh*, and that of the bishopric of *Gardhar*, which is stated in the Sagas to have flourished centuries ago. The results are mentioned as being already sufficiently important to reward these researches.

Geography and Antiquities have hereby obtained many illustrations, which have been mentioned in the Annual [Danish] Reports of the Society, and of which detailed accounts have been given in its published Archaeological Memoirs. M. W. A. Graah, captain in the Danish navy, has greatly facilitated these researches by constructing, from his own surveys, and some other sources obtained on the spot, a special map of the district of Julianehaab, on which are indicated all the ancient Scandinavian ruins of which there are any certain indications. This map, which is now out of the engraver's hands, will appear in the work on 'The Voyages of Discovery made by the Ancient Scandinavians to North America,' and that on 'The Historical Monuments of Greenland,' which the Society is engaged in printing. M. J. Mathusen, inspector of the colony of Julianehaab, having also proposed to the Society to undertake a thorough investigation of the ruins of a church, and of some other ancient remains, which have been discovered on the northern shore of the Gulf of Ingulikko, and from which some years ago, a stone, inscribed with Runes, was forwarded to the Society, his proposal was referred to a Committee, two members of which had themselves visited the places, and being approved by them, the Society has undertaken to defray the expenses of excavating and investigating these ruins, which, according to the description given of them, are so numerous as to suggest the inference that they are the remains of a city.—Séance Annuelle, 1836, pp. 2, 3.

Some of the publications of the Society have been already indicated in the foregoing extract. As it would be impossible to give the titles of all the memoirs, dissertations, &c., which are in course of publication by the Society, we will confine ourselves to the mention of such ancient MSS. on Northern Literature as were published by them in the years 1834 and 1835. These include, of the *FORNMANNA SÆGUR*, vols. ix. and x.; of *OLD-NORDISKE SAGAER*, vols. ix. and x.; and of the *SCRIPTA HISTORICA ISLANDORUM*, vol. vi. The two former of these contain the original Icelandic text, and Danish translations, published separately, of the Sagas of Hakon Sverreson, Guttorm Sigurdson, Inge Bardson, Hakon Hakonson, and Magnus Sagaboeter, kings of Norway, extending from the years 1184 to the year 1274. The latter is a Latin translation of the Sagas of the Norwegian kings, Magnus the Good, and Harald Haardraarde and his sons, extending from 1035 to 1093. Other Sagas are since published and in course of publication.

With respect to the value of these Sagas, it will be at once obvious, that every thing must depend upon the degree of credit they are entitled to as authentic documents. Their genuineness is beyond all question; being at once decided by the language in which they are for the most part written, which, though now confined to Iceland, whence it is called Icelandic, was formerly spoken by all the Scandinavian nations; in a word, throughout Norway, Sweden, and perhaps the greater part of Denmark. Should their authenticity, however, be called in question, it must, like that of other ancient writings, be tried upon the ordinary principles which decide such questions. To us Englishmen this matter is the more interesting, because the Danish Society has announced the publication of a collection of Sagas upon British and Irish history. We will therefore, first lay before our readers an arranged conspectus of these Sagas, and then return to the question of their authenticity. The specification does not pretend to completeness, but it is amply sufficient to convey an idea of the publications comprised in the plan. These are:—

‘A. *Separate Sagas.*

‘1. *JATVARDAR SAGA ENS HELGA*, or a History of the canonized king Edward, surnamed the Confessor.

‘2. *THE SAGAS OF THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY*, Dunstan, Thomas, and Anselm. None of these have hitherto been published; they will therefore be now for the first time brought to light, and be printed partly from ancient parchments.

‘3. *ORKNEYINGA SAGA*, or the history of the Orkney and Shetland Isles, and partly of Scotland, from A.D. 865 to 1231. Of this remarkable work there is only one edition, (Copenhagen, 1780,) chiefly printed from a modern paper manuscript, and by no means from the celebrated *Codex Flateyensis* (written on parchment in the

fourteenth century) which has not at all been used or consulted in its publication, but will form the basis of the new Edition, which will also be augmented by many additions, and various readings from other Codices, which have been neglected in the older edition.

4. *SAGA MAGNUSS EYIAJARLS HINS HELGA*, containing a minute account of the life of the Jarl Magnus Erlendson, who died in 1110, and was afterwards canonized and generally worshipped in Northern Britain and Scandinavia. This Saga also has only been once published from recent paper manuscripts, but will now be published for the first time from the oldest MS. which is written on skin, and will at the same time be furnished with the additions and various readings which other remarkable transcripts afford. These two last mentioned Sagas give a very luminous description of the state of political society and manners in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and beginning of the thirteenth centuries of the Scottish isles, and of Scotland itself; particularly in as far as regards the districts which had been inhabited or subdued by people of Scandinavian origin, from whom the present inhabitants of the Orkneys, Shetland and Caithness, &c., chiefly descend. The life of Magnus was written in 1130, and the above mentioned general history of the Orkneys was compiled, doubtless in part, from much more ancient writings, about 1240. These two works are therefore considerably older than that of any native Scottish historian.

5. An Account of *HELGE* and *ULF*, inhabitants of the Orkneys, from an ancient manuscript written on skin.

B. *Extracts from Icelandic historical works* of the middle ages, relating to the history of England, Scotland, and Ireland, viz. from the following important works—

1. *SNORRE STURLESONS CELEBRATED HEIMSKRINGLA*. Of this work we have four editions in the original language, of which that published at Copenhagen (1777—1783, in 3 vols. folio,) is the most copious and the best, but it by no means satisfies the critical demands of our age, the text being very gratuitously put together from different codices, occasionally even from modern unauthentic transcriptions; and besides, the sources from which the altered readings are taken are frequently not mentioned, so that the age and value of the accounts often cannot be critically determined.

The portions of this important work inserted in the publication now announced, will be accurately transcribed from the oldest and best skin manuscripts that are extant, and furnished with the requisite additions from other good transcripts.

2. *THE LANDNAMA*, as it is called, or *LANDNAMABOK* of *ICELAND*, called also *LIBER ORIGINUM ISLANDIÆ*. This work contains the history of the earliest colony and colonists in Iceland. Those portions of it which relate to natives of Britain or Iceland, who during the eighth, ninth, or tenth centuries, had established themselves in Iceland, will here be inserted. Of this important work we have, it is true, three different editions; but in none of them has due attention been paid to this circumstance, that the work consists of three different principal recensions compiled by different authors, the eldest of which ought to form the basis, and the text of the next in age ought to be separated

from the others ; whereas only the most recent has hitherto been published. In the present publication we intend to follow, for the first time, an entirely opposite method, whereby the character and age of the accounts may be critically determined.

‘3. EXTRACTS FROM MANY OTHER SAGAS AND ANNALS of the kings of Norway and Denmark ; also of Icelandic Warriors, Scalds, &c., and other distinguished men, who during the middle ages have had any connexion with England, Scotland, or Ireland.*

‘C. Extracts from the ancient *Historians* and *Chroniclers* of Denmark and Sweden ; also chronological annotations.

‘D. *Remarkable Diplomas* of the middle ages, issued in the Orkney or Shetland Isles, or in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, or Iceland, having reference to Britain or Ireland ; of which a great part have not hitherto been published.

‘E. *Northern Runes*, inscriptions relating to the expeditions of the Northmen to the British Islands, or which in any way concern those countries or their inhabitants. —*Antiqq. Britt.*, pp. 3—5.

The hints of information conveyed in the preceding extracts, with regard to the distinctive characters of the MSS. and printed editions referred to, certainly indicate, on the part of the editors of these publications, the requisite ability to form a judgment of their value as authentic documents. It is not, however, a case in which we are obliged to depend on their judgment, or even on that of any British antiquaries, which, though less competent in the present case, some might more willingly follow. The testimony of Donald Gregory, Esq., Sec. S. A., Edinburgh, might otherwise be alleged in their favour ; who very justly remarks, ‘that the ‘most important events of the north and west of Scotland, were ‘connected with the Norwegians, and therefore, as might have ‘been expected, the best and most accurate account of these ‘events is to be found in the Norwegian Sagas, whose antiquity ‘would sufficiently warrant their accuracy, were it not further ‘confirmed by the remarkable fact, that wherever the same ‘events are alluded to in the Irish annals, the account contained ‘in the Sagas, even though at variance with generally received ‘history, is invariably borne out in the fullest manner by these ‘invaluable annals.’

That the Sagas, *as a whole*, have been overvalued by some, as well as undervalued by others, is, on the part of all competent judges, an admitted fact ; as true is it that both errors have pro-

* Agreeably to the wish expressed by several British antiquaries, those romances connected with the remote middle ages of England and Wales, which were translated into Icelandic or Old-northern in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from originals, which in many instances have been long since lost, will be published simultaneously with these extracts, but apart from the historical pieces, and in a separate volume. These translations, as they now exist, are as specimens of language well deserving of publication.

ceeded from a want of discrimination. The term *Saga*, which is equivalent to 'Story,' or 'History,' has been in fact applied, as the Society's editors have stated, to three classes of writings: 1. Mythic compositions, or the legends of the olden time, respecting heathen deities, heroes, &c., written in the middle ages. 2. Genuine historical writings, belonging to the same period. 3. Compositions, purely fictitious, which are chiefly of more modern date. It will of course be immediately seen, that it is to the second only of these classes that Mr. Gregory's testimony refers, and that the pieces selected for publication, belong, with one noted exception, exclusively to the same class.

Look we however for direct positive evidence which may be adduced in support of these ancient writings, it would seem that the authentic character of some of them, at least, has already been confirmed by the discoveries which have already resulted from the investigations in Greenland. The remains at Julianehaab, and on the northern shore of the firth of Ingalikko, which have been already mentioned, are said to coincide in a remarkable manner with the representations of the *Sagas* in reference to the voyages of discovery made by the Scandinavians to North America, in the tenth and following centuries, and to the once flourishing bishopric of Gardhar. The *Sagas* on this subject, and which were announced to leave the press at the close of last summer, have probably by this time, laid this branch of evidence before the public.

The authenticity of some of these interesting documents appears, again, on the testimony both of Danish and of British writers, to have received confirmation of a kind to which scholars are accustomed in these days, and justly, to ascribe the highest value, we mean the consenting evidence of scientific observations. The date, for instance, of King Hakon Hakonson's expedition to Scotland, and of the battle of Largs in the year 1263, is recorded more correctly in the Icelandic or Norwegian *Saga*, than in the accounts of the native historians themselves, on the evidence of Dr. Brewster's astronomical calculation of an eclipse recorded in the *Saga*. Similar confirmation has also, it would appear, been rendered to another of the *Sagas*, by the calculations of the Norwegian astronomer, Hansteen, who found that an eclipse, of which a particular description is given in the *Saga*, and which is described as being seen at or about the time when the battle of Stiklestad in Norway was fought, actually occurred in 1030, the year mentioned in the *Saga* as the date of the battle. All persons who are aware of the extent to which astronomical calculations are employed, and what service they have rendered, in fixing the epochs both of sacred and profane history, and particularly of the exactly parallel instance, in which, with a view to illustrate Grecian history, the very same astronomical methods

have been adopted to discover the precise site and date of a battle fought in Asia Minor, which was recorded to have been interrupted by an eclipse, will at once feel that confirmations of this description are of the very greatest weight.

But we must come to a close. Our interest in early British history has drawn us out to a length which we had by no means intended. In reference to the Danish Society, whose publications have furnished the theme of our lengthened observations, and which, having been in operation for some years with most unrelenting perseverance and success, stands in no need of our commendation, we have only to add that it is under the immediate patronage of the King of Denmark, and numbers among its members some of the most distinguished names both in native and in foreign literature.

Art. IV. *The Political History of England during the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries.* By FREDERICK VON RAUMER, Professor of History in the University of Berlin. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 550 & 534. Richter and Co., London.

THE author of the work at the head of this article, became generally known in this country somewhat less than two years ago, by a translation from the German of two volumes bearing his name, and entitled, 'History of the Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries Illustrated by Original Documents.' We read those volumes with interest. They consist indeed of little more than passages from historical documents, arranged by the collector with only such slight observations of his own as were necessary to render them intelligible and agreeable in the case of the general reader. But the book seemed to indicate a genuine love of research; and the matter contained in it, could not have been selected, upon the whole, so judiciously, without a considerable acquaintance with the state of knowledge in this and other countries, in relation to the more conspicuous characters and events in the history of modern Europe. We did not part from our author, therefore, without deeming him entitled to the praise of well-directed industry, nor without holding him in some esteem, as a scholar who seemed to be guided in his pursuits by liberal feeling.

Our suspicions, however, as to the strict right of our new acquaintance to so respectable a position as that in which we had been disposed to place him, began to grow strong, when we became aware that he had made his appearance in England, with letters of introduction sufficiently numerous to serve him, one would think, should it be his pleasure, to proceed as far as the planet

Herschel before his return. And when our studious explorer of manuscripts, our man of the yellow parchment and the dusty tome, was said to have so far emerged from his cloistered contempt of the vain pageantry and glory of the living world, as to have become quite the lion in not a few of our gayest circles, hardly more pleased apparently with seeing than with being seen, we were not a little perplexed by such tidings. We were also told that it was not more true that our Teutonic visitor had been gazed at in this place, and in that, and in many more, than that no one knew where he was to be seen next—so mercurial had been the effect of our atmosphere upon him. The magic touch of our shores on the chains of the slave we all know, and those of us who are eloquent of course mean never to forget it; but we had still to learn the potency of our soil to separate between the lettered recluse, and all those habits of quiet gravity, obscure labour, and modest loneliness, which are so natural to his vocation.

Still we were willing to hope the best, and waited until the promised fruit of this quicksilver visit should be laid before us in the shape of 'Letters on England.' Historians, indeed, of all men, are least disposed to conclude that what it is well to do, it is always well to do quickly: but we were not sure of the extent to which a German professor's power of intuition might reach; and we were therefore inclined to think it possible that a glance in passing might suffice, in the case of one of these far-famed personages, to a clear understanding of those questions and differences among us with which our own slower apprehension has been long busied, and with only a very partial measure of success. We were the more confirmed in this expectation of the wonderful, by the assurance that the translators and the printers were prosecuting their labours with a speed that could not be accelerated if the conclusion of their toils involved of necessity the salvation of the empire, superseding at once the doings of reformers and conservatives to the end of time. Judge then, good reader, of our disappointment, when on reading these Letters on England, we find in them, along with occasional remarks, which seem to bespeak the presence of good sense and good feeling, a mass of common-places about England, which a man of discernment in this country would hardly think of uttering in talk, much less of committing to writing, and revising for the press; and when we discover throughout the work, a peremptory method of recording opinions concerning the great questions agitated among us, and the parties into which we are divided, which would lead a man to suppose that there is hardly more consideration required to adjust the affairs of Ireland, than to settle the simplest question in human policy. It may be that in Germany, much of the matter of fact, contained in the work adverted to, would not be without its interest or use; but we have not been able to discover the

attraction or utility of three-fourths of it to any person of ordinary intelligence in England. The book, nevertheless, was puffed off, as the great novelty and treat of the season.

In fact we have felt not a little ashamed, as we have witnessed the manner in which a man of considerable literary and moral worth, has been stilted into a false prominence by some of our literary coteries, and made to mistake the rank in which their folly has placed him for his real position. Von Raumer has few of the qualities which these silly people attribute to him. His mind is rather active than laborious. He is disposed to meddle with many things, but he exhausts nothing. He has busied himself with the surface, but wants both the steadiness and strength necessary to go on any occasion very far beneath it. He is not incapable of making an acute remark, and his style, though by no means of that elaborate and finished character which generally distinguishes what is destined to continue, is clear and natural. But philosophical history—the thing which he particularly affects, and which has respect to the development of character, more than to the mere course of events—is greatly beyond his powers. Those who have taught him to think otherwise, whether in England or Germany, have done him much injury. His disposition to research, and his facility in narration, would make him a good historian of a less ambitious character. The succession of occurrences, and the social institutions, and general manners of a people, he could set forth with vivacity and effect; but he has too much of the elder D'Israeli in him ever to be a good critic on matters of art or literature, and is especially wanting in the comprehensiveness, patience, and vigour of understanding, necessary to compress the masses of historical facts so as to extract their real spirit from them. There is, in truth, more of the Frenchman than of the German in his character; so much of the volatile as to produce frequent confusion from the want of a due attention to dates, and to prevent his making the best use of what he really knows. From this cause he may often be seen to pull down in one paragraph, what he had set up in the preceding, and evidently without the remotest suspicion on his own part of having done so. The power of 'summing up,' of holding a number of varying and conflicting testimonies steadily in view, so as to be influenced justly by each and all of them in forming a conclusion, requires the most commanding powers of intellect, and powers just of that kind in which Von Raumer is deficient. Not a little of this kind of ability is necessary to judge correctly in regard to the reality of the general occurrences of history; much more of it is required when the character of an individual is to be ascertained; and still more when the conclusion to be formed has respect to the character of a people, consisting necessarily of innumerable parts, originating in sources of the most various and subtle description.

We find in the work before us sufficient evidence, both of the favourable and the unfavourable, in this view of the character of its author. This Political History of England, it should be observed, was published in Germany, as part of a General History of Europe, an extended work, on which Von Raumer is still engaged. His translator, however, is careful to inform us that the histories of England and France since the age of Charles V., were viewed by the author as complete pictures in themselves, and that being so viewed, they were both treated as separately as they would have been if published alone. Every thing to be known about England, therefore, from Von Raumer's History of Modern Europe, will be found in these volumes.

When it is stated, that our history from the accession of Henry VIII. to that of Elizabeth, is despatched in 100 loosely printed pages, our readers will not be at a loss to understand the degree of value which may be attached to that portion of the work. The sketch, however, thus given, is executed with considerable spirit, and is not materially inaccurate. But it is of course every way defective, considered as a picture of those times, and the impression it is adapted to produce is in many respects imperfect and erroneous. It is true that Henry was a depraved tyrant, that he made his ministers in succession so many scape-goats to bear away his sins from the sight of his people, and that after the sacrifice of each, he deemed himself at liberty to descend to new and more flagrant oppressions; it is true also that his parliaments generally manifested a base subserviency to his will; and that, notwithstanding all his tyranny and cruelty, he was a popular king. But it is not less true, that his oppressions had respect generally to the priesthood and the powerful, and not to the mass of the people; that the English constitution, as described by Fortesque before Henry's accession, and by Sir Thomas Smith not long after his decease, presents the noble theory of a free government, and that the nation, while submitting for a while to the arbitrary rule of the king in regard to the great and to ecclesiastical affairs, was by no means unconscious of the difference between it in this respect and the people of other countries, asserting its independence on more than one occasion through the medium of parliament. We cannot forget the encounter between the proud Wolsey, with his retinue, and the politic Moore, with the Commons at his back; but that scene, so characteristic of the men, of the age, and the country, and in fact nearly every thing peculiar to the history of England during that period, as compared with the history of a continental monarchy, has been overlooked in this 'Political History of England, written on the plan of tracing the progress of human improvement, and the predominance of ideas.'

Von Raumer is not a disciple of the school of Hume; but his

want of an adequate grasp of his subject, has led him to treat this portion of our history too much as a writer of that school would have done. The existing ideas on ecclesiastical affairs are, however, more fully and correctly given. The following passage relates to the uncertain and conflicting state of opinion during the reign of Henry VIII.

‘So long as temporal matters, taxes, privileges, rights of sovereignty, were in question, the clergy and laity placed themselves, in a very natural manner, opposite to each other, and the movements were directed by simple laws. But when the examination of doctrines was gradually entered upon, (respecting which most of the clergy and laity were in the most profound ignorance, and of which, in a great degree, no human mind can attain a perfectly clear view,) many became confused; fluctuated between one extreme and the other; were intolerant, declaring others for heretics, as soon as they had taken up an opinion and adhered to it. The gratification of being allowed to examine and decide, where formerly unconditional obedience was required; the novelty of the doctrines; the pleasure of conquering in the disputes; the zeal and perseverance of the reformers; aversion to the exercises of the old doctrine and to its priests, may be considered as the main reasons of the rapid progress of innovations. On the other hand, the right conceded to the people of examining and deciding matters of such importance, appeared to be prejudicial to the doctrine of temporal prerogatives, and to the new ecclesiastical power of the king; and the insurrections of the peasants in Germany were considered as a confirmation of the anxious suspicion. To this it must be added, that Henry, notwithstanding his having broken with the pope, hated Luther and his doctrines as much as ever; would not upon any account be called a heretic, or give the Roman Catholic princes any further offence. The mere separation from Rome, at which many probably aimed, appeared to some to be excusable, whereas others affirmed that, with the rejection of the papal power, a great portion of the doctrines and usages fell to the ground. Besides, political considerations ought not to decide in preference to others; on the contrary, truth ought to be pursued, regardless of the consequences, and entire confidence placed in the providence of God. But as both parties knew that no direct contradiction availed against the king’s obstinate and violent temper, they endeavoured to gain him by excessive, nay, unlimited concessions, by which his influence unexpectedly increased to an almost incredible height, and inspired him with the foolish and tyrannical idea, of limiting the faith of the whole people to a narrow line, arbitrarily fixed by himself.’—Vol. I., pp. 33—35.

When reviewing the conduct of queen Mary, our author remarks, that ‘Gardiner and Bonner represented that tolerance led to indifference, and that improvements in doctrine, discipline, and constitution, advantageous as they might be otherwise, were not now to be thought of, *because this would only confirm the complaints of the reformed, and furnish them with new pretexts.*’ Such was the argument of Bancroft, addressed to James I., at

Hampton Court—reform nothing, or you will concede that the puritans have been in the right in their controversy with us. And in this feeling have we not the great difficulty of the pious men of our established church at the present day, with respect to the reforms which they must know to be desirable in their communion? It surely cannot be deemed good by them that they should take upon them vows which they never mean to perform; or that they should solemnly express their approval of customs which their conscience must assuredly condemn. But to reform the church would be to give the palm to the dissenter in his controversy with her. This consideration, we suspect, more than any natural or wise dread of change, is the great barrier in the way of any approximation toward the devout men of other communions. We hope ere long to reason this matter at some length with pious Episcopalians, and to do so in the spirit of friendly expostulation.

In this history, the age of Elizabeth occupies three times the space assigned to the three preceding reigns. Yet, if we except the portion which relates to the queen of Scots, every topic is treated in the same hasty and imperfect manner. The character of individuals, of parties, and of events, is given with facility; but much is wanting to bring up the picture to the life, and the misconceptions of the author become more frequent and considerable. The following is Von Raumer's account of the puritans of that age, and will afford us an opportunity of showing the sort of defectiveness and inaccuracy which are of almost constant occurrence in the views presented in these volumes.

The protestants recognized the king as supreme head, even in ecclesiastical matters; retained the gradation of spiritual dignities, archbishops, bishops, &c., as well as several formalities and ceremonies which appeared to be similar to the old catholic forms. The principles of the puritans, on the contrary, were, on the whole, as follows: civil government is of human, church government of divine origin; therefore the former is every where subordinate, and the supreme decision belongs to the latter. In ecclesiastical matters, only what is absolutely necessary must be prescribed, but the temporal government must not interfere, and especially not order any thing respecting the ceremonies, liturgy, &c. Ceremonies, images, altars, crosses, organs, music, a distinguishing dress for the clergy, &c., are condemnable; likewise singing, dancing, fencing, particularly on a Sunday, which must be kept strictly holy. All gradations of dignities in the church must cease, and temporal offices and parliamentary rights must be immediately taken from the negligent bishops. Ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction belong solely to the congregation and synod; every penalty imposed by laymen is illegal, and the oath of supremacy to be rejected. The appointment to offices in the church shall never be made by kings and patrons, but by the choice of the congregations. Whoever defends the late impure and detestable constitution of the

church is not a good subject, but a traitor to God and his word. More violent persons went still further, and said, 'The queen, like every other person, is liable to excommunication by the elders of the church, and an excommunicated person is not to be obeyed, and cannot govern. The ministers are lost atheists, and we must pray to God no longer to suffer the pollution of his sanctuary. All the remains of popish idolatry must be extirpated, and it is by no means unlawful to put those to death who defend such heathenism.

'While advocates of the puritans praised and extolled their simple, serious course of life, their morality and liberal sentiments; their adversaries blamed the above mentioned exaggerations, and affirmed, that the majority were by no means composed of innocent, harmless men, but of ambitious persons; and who, impatient of all control, would willingly dissolve the temporal, as well as spiritual government, and introduce a new one, resembling their own democratic constitution of the church.

'If we impartially compare the accusation and defence, it appears that, in many puritans, there was a laudable endeavour at Christian morality, and that they resisted, with praise-worthy courage, both civil and ecclesiastical tyranny. But, on the other hand, there was in their notions of church and state, too much Jewish strictness and partiality. The cheerful side of life, which is by no means contrary to genuine Christianity, appeared to their gloomy minds to be profane: their too narrow rules paid no regard to the differences which age, sex, property, rank, ability, &c., produce in the world; and while they undervalued much that was of importance, they attached a false value to trifles. Thus, for instance, they gave strange names to their children; 'Reformation—From Above—Enough—Free Gift—Rejoice Again—The Lord is Nigh—More Fruit, &c.;' and plainly showed that if ever the power should come into their hands, they would exercise greater intolerance than they now suffered.'—Vol. I., pp. 292—294.

From this passage the reader will learn nothing as to the relative number of the puritans at the queen's accession, nothing as to the modesty of their claims during a series of years afterwards, nothing as to the causes which led them at a later period to extend their complaints, nor is it in any way intimated that those who suffered under the arbitrary rule of the prelates, did so mostly on account of nonconformity in small matters, which might have been safely dispensed with, and that to such matters the scruples of the majority, even to the last, principally referred. All these points, however, and many more, must come into careful review, before the question respecting the conduct of the puritans under Elizabeth can be understood.

The greater, and much the more intelligent portion of the protestant population of this kingdom, in the early days of Elizabeth, were puritans, or persons at least who were desirous that the ritual of the church should be cleansed to a greater extent from the admixture of papal observances. Elizabeth's first convocation of the clergy was in the fourth year of her reign,

and it was no secret in that assembly that archbishop Parker and the queen were strongly opposed to any change in the religious ceremonies. Warm debates, however, arose on that subject, and the obnoxious ceremonies were saved by a single vote only—the division being as fifty-nine to fifty-eight, and nearly half of this minority were from the ranks of the dignified clergy. It would not be difficult to demonstrate that the most learned and distinguished portion of the hierarchy were at that time on the side of puritanism; and of the feeling of the parochial clergy, some judgment may be formed from the fact, that three years later, one-third of the clergy of the metropolis resigned their cures rather than appear in the apparel imposed by the queen and her commissioners. Father Parsons, whose testimony is good evidence on this point, states, that the puritans were everywhere a more numerous and formidable body than the conformists, especially in the great towns. But the puritan majority submitted to the conformist minority, partly from the mixture of fear and affection with which they regarded the queen, and partly from deeming that submission a much less evil than the return of the catholic, their common enemy, to power.

Von Raumer, who overlooks these material facts in the history of the puritan controversy, is no less at fault in regard to the time when it assumed its more uncompromising spirit, the causes which produced that change, and the extent in which its extreme dogmas prevailed among its partizans. Elizabeth ascended the throne in 1558. Her systematic persecution of the clergy on account of their vestments, began in 1565; and it was not until the impolitic and unjust courses then adopted had been prosecuted for five years, the hardships attending them having spread an exasperated feeling very widely both among the clergy and the laity, that Cartwright became distinguished as the leader of a class of puritans who had learnt to extend their objections from the worship of the church to its polity, demanding such a reform of its government as would have rendered it rather presbyterian than prelatical. Violence had thus produced violence, to the great sorrow of moderate men both among the puritans and in the queen's government, when Whitgift became primate, and exceeded the severity of Parker. But after all the expulsion and coercion to which he resorted, Whitgift saw, in the last year of his life, a petition presented to king James, bearing the signatures of nearly a thousand puritan clergymen, praying for reform. But for what reform did they pray? Not for that overthrow of the church and state, and that exclusive establishment of their own polity, which their enemies affirmed to be the fixed object of every man among them, but (and no doubt to the great regret of those enemies) for some slight changes in matters of ceremony. Extravagant and intolerant maxims were no doubt avowed, but

it was by men who had been goaded to such extremes by oppression, and it then became the policy of the government to impute those extreme opinions to the whole, and to deal with them accordingly. The coercive measures of the government were the *cause*, not the *effect*, of those tenets among the puritans which were most hostile to the hierarchy.

All this Von Raumer might have known by a little attention to some of the works which he quotes,* and which we must suppose he has read, and, knowing these things, he should not have passed them over. Some of the puritans were unreasonable enough to maintain that no person exposing the Gospel to scandal, by open immorality, should be permitted to unite in the communion of the church, whatever might be the station of the offender, which, we presume, is what Von Raumer principally intends by stating that they paid 'no respect to the differences produced in the world by age, sex, rank, ability,' &c. &c. ! The accusation of giving their children strange names, as—Reformation, From Above, Free Gift, &c. &c., has only a slight foundation in truth as applied to the puritans of any age, and none at all, we believe, as applied to those of the times of Elizabeth. The well-known story of the Essex jury, from which Hume and Zachary Gray, in their fanatical hatred of fanaticism, derived so much pleasure, is the evident source of our author's notion in this matter. But those who will be at the pains to trace that story to its source, will find it to be a pitiful invention, published for the first time in the eighteenth century, and applied to the puritans of the time of Charles I. Cromwell's first parliament, commonly known by the name of Barebone's parliament, is so described by Hume and others, as to insinuate the conclusion that the body then assembled consisted of a herd of vulgar natures, all bearing names of this fantastic description. But it so happens that the names of those persons have come down to us, and, with the exception of the one man, named Barebone, and whose Christian name was 'Praise God,' there is no more of this peculiarity of puritanism observable in the list than might be found in one of those majorities of late so frequently at the heels of that very puritanical personage—Lord Lyndhurst. We advert to this fact, not as meaning to affirm that the puritans were altogether free from the weakness, or the ill-regulated taste, imputed to them in this respect, but in order to show how small a portion of what is asserted or insinuated, by a certain class of writers, on this and on similar topics is deserving of credit.

Now these additions and corrections, with respect to the character of the puritans under Elizabeth, as set forth by Von

* Neal, Hallam, Vaughan's Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty, &c. &c.

Raumer, are a fair specimen of the kind of supplement which is necessary in regard to almost every question of importance in our history as treated—or rather touched upon, in the work before us. The modern history of England is one of those subjects that could not be treated justly and efficiently in the way of abridgment, even by a Bacon or a Bossuet. Its revolutions were not the effect of mere court intrigue, as in the case of the other old monarchies of Europe, but originated in causes affecting the whole community. They were great changes, resulting from the influence of great public principles. The parties thus called into existence were formidable, from their numbers and ramifications, but still more from their intelligence, and prepared to endure much, and to dare much, in favour of the objects before them. Characters the most various, and the most strongly marked, were thus brought into prominence, and developed by means of circumstances the most diversified and complex. It is strictly necessary that the historian should be acquainted with these circumstances, that he should know them familiarly, that he should be capable of estimating them according to the degree of credit due to the parties reporting them, and, above all, that he should be competent wisely to observe their influence on the men whose passions, principles, and conduct were affected by them. When the leaders and the masses of a community, instead of moving like a battalion, in implicit obedience to their chief, are wont to concern themselves thus with the aspects of the times, and to yield to the pressure of circumstances more than to individual authority, history in such a case ceases to be of the description that may be set forth, with any desirable result, in the manner of outline, or, in other words, to be of the kind that may be 'made easy.' Little is to be inferred at such times from single acts, or expressions of the moment, in regard to the character of individuals or of parties. There is too much of hurry, unexpectedness, and perplexity, connected with the movements of public affairs, to allow it to be possible that individuals, or bodies of men, should be at all times in full possession of themselves. It is from all the great facts of their history, and from a multitude of subsidiary circumstances which give to those facts their particular complexion, that the conclusions of the historian must be deduced, if they are to be correct, and to make any tolerable approach toward the whole truth.

But in this Political History of England we have a work on no such plan. Its design is to present only the more considerable and characteristic events of the time, for the purpose of bringing out its peculiar spirit; but as the events have not been adequately presented, the said spirit, though invoked, does not come. The premises of our logician are defective and faulty, and his conclusions are like them. In fact we have become not a little sus-

picious of this philosophical manner, as it is called, of writing history, even when undertaken by men of the first ability. It is no doubt highly gratifying to be persuaded that we belong to that class of minds which may well leave the full and regular narration of events, on the old classical model, to the dull heads which are content to employ themselves mainly with that matter—our own powers being such as to render it enough that we should throw a rapid glance over the revolutions of the past, in order to perceive both the spirit by which they were animated, and the lessons they afford to the future. The temptation here commends itself equally to our indolence and our vanity, and not less, perhaps, to our feelings of partizanship. It is to be more intellectual than the ancients, and with less labour; and being at liberty to take very general views of other times, a little ingenuity may suffice to make them speak almost any language to our own. Men of extraordinary power and integrity may guard in a great degree against these dangers; but the success of such authors must always call forth a crowd of imitators, and the result is often lamentable, leading the superficial to conclude that there can be no certainty in history, nor any real benefit in the study of it, since all sorts of reports may be made concerning its transactions, and every kind of inference deduced from them. What we want, is not so meagre an account of facts as may leave the appearance of plausibility to the most ill-founded speculations; but rather that the full narration of the ancients should retain its proper dignity, as constituting the real body of history, and that to this body there should be given as much as possible of the soul of intelligence and utility. Among those writers who complain of the want of this soul in the ancient historians, there are very few indeed whom a wise man would recommend to attempt any thing in the way of philosophy themselves beyond what will be found in those models, upon which, in the fulness of their complacency, they are disposed to look down as falling so much below their own wonderful conceptions. Many writers, who might have obtained some permanent credit as historians, have altogether failed in consequence of having imbibed the notion that they were capable of doing these things more intellectually than Thucydides or Tacitus.

If there is much in the account which Von Raumer has given of the affairs of England, previous to the accession of the house of Stuart, to call forth remarks of this nature, the same kind of objection may be made with even greater propriety to the manner in which he has disposed of the reign of James I. The author, indeed, observes, that in this part of his narrative he has only treated of 'the principal matters, without strict regard to the 'order of time,' this period being viewed as merely introductory to the reign of Charles I. But it should be remembered that it

was an introduction of more than twenty years' duration, and one in which political principles and parties acquired that complexion and power which served to render the history of the twenty years that followed so memorable. Then, especially, all the existing controversies, with respect both to the church and the state, became allied more or less with the dogma of divine right.

Von Raumer has justly observed, that this pretension on the part of the crown, naturally disposed the advocates of popular government to assert the sovereignty of the people on similar grounds. And we may safely conclude that we should not have heard so much during the seventeenth century, of the voice of the people as being the voice of God, had not kings announced themselves as his peculiar vicegerents, and as being responsible to him alone. But our author might have gone further into the philosophy of the controversies of those times, had he been sufficiently familiar with the subject to perceive that the alleged effect of the novel doctrine of divine right as applied to kings, was precisely the counterpart of the effect which was produced by it as applied to bishops. The one taught the popular leaders to connect a sort of divine right with the sovereignty of the people; and the other taught the puritans, both in Scotland and in England, to lay claim to the same exclusive authority in favour of their discipline.

In the age of Cranmer it was the legally established doctrine of the Church of England, that the only permanent orders found in the New Testament are those of priest and deacon, all others being a matter of purely civil institution. Lord Bacon describes the steps by which the ruling clergy receded from this ground, until checked by finding themselves on the threshold of the Vatican. 'First, those ceremonies which were pretended to be corrupt, they maintained to be things indifferent, and opposed the examples of the good times of the church to that challenge which was made unto them, because they were used in the late superstitious times. They then were also content mildly to acknowledge many imperfections in the church: as tares come up amongst the corn; which yet, according to the wisdom taught by our Saviour, were not with strife to be pulled up, lest it might spoil and supplant the good corn, but to grow on together until the harvest. After they grew to a more absolute defence and maintenance of all the orders of the church, and stiffly to hold that nothing was to be innovated, partly because it needed not, partly because it would make a breach upon the rest. Hence, *exasperated through contentions*, they are fallen to a direct condemnation of the contrary part as of a sect. Yea, and *some indiscreet persons* have been bold, in open preaching, to use dishonourable and derogatory speech of the churches

‘abroad (presbyterian churches), and that *so far as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers.*’* Bancroft, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, was the first protestant disputant in this country who became so ‘bold and indiscreet’ as to affirm that men not ordained by bishops were no ministers; and the doctrine of which Bacon had heard but distantly and indistinctly at the close of the sixteenth century, was to become so general no long time afterwards, as to call forth the antagonist power of the league and covenant, and to sow those seeds of ecclesiastical discord and intolerance which are still so rife among us. Nor can there be peace, nor ought there to be peace, so long as this arrogant dogma, which unchristianizes three-fourths of the Protestants of Europe, from the times of Luther downwards, shall be maintained. Bacon adverts to the effect of this pernicious doctrine on the opinions and temper of the puritans in England, one extravagance naturally producing another, but he did not live to see the same effect result, upon a larger scale, from the same cause, in Scotland.

The best portion of Von Raumer's work is that which treats of the controversy between Charles I. and the three parliaments convened and dismissed by him soon after his accession. On the remaining chapters we could offer much comment, but must desist. The struggle which extends through the whole of that reign is not to be seen in its true light without a careful attention to the character of that unhappy prince, as both the nature and issues of the conflict resulted mainly from his personal qualities. And the character of Charles I., like that of the parties who were most active in his reign, is not to be learnt from the extravagant commendations bestowed upon it in some quarters, nor from the indiscriminate censure to which it is subjected in others. In his person this monarch was of a middle stature, and well proportioned; sufficiently active to be capable of bearing much fatigue, and of making, upon occasions, vigorous exertion. His features were rather handsome than otherwise. His fair complexion in youth, darkened with years; and over the whole countenance there was an expression of thoughtfulness and feeling which gave it an air of melancholy—an aspect, however, which seems to have been derived more from the manner in which he was accustomed to regard the past and the present, than from any want of a sanguine temper in relation to the future. Charles gave many proofs of courage; but that virtue, (if such it may be called) from the want of being guided by a more sound discretion, frequently partook, in civil affairs, of the nature of rashness. There was also much dignity in his demeanour, but coupled generally with a

* Advertisement, touching the Controversies of the Church of England.

degree of coldness and reserve which strangers felt to be repulsive, and which served to keep up a stately distance *between him* and the persons who were most in his confidence. His temperance and chastity, when we call to mind the scenes in which he had passed his youth, will appear among his most praiseworthy qualities; and his economy, without descending to meanness, or bordering on avarice, was a marked improvement on the example set before him by his predecessor. Nor could this prince be charged with cruelty, except in a few cases, when his favourite projects were opposed in a manner which aroused his resentment and alarmed his policy in a greater degree than was ordinary. In all these respects, had his lot been cast in private life, Charles I. might have obtained general esteem; but while a stranger to adversity, there would have been little in him in that condition, any more than in his real history, to have made him an object of affection.

In religion the defects of his character were more manifest, in consequence of the degree in which it was connected with superstition and intolerance. But his ruling passion was a love of arbitrary power. Not that he was intent on exercising such power in the more extravagant acts of tyranny. Like his feeble and pedantic father he was pleased rather with the possession than the abuse of power. One effect of this passion was to stimulate his efforts in support of episcopacy; and the ardour with which it was cherished served also to make him less and less scrupulous in regard to truth and sincerity, whenever the gratification of that feeling was the end pursued. So earnest and so fixed was his desire to possess larger powers than the constitution had ceded to him, that nothing short of the constant pressure of necessity sufficed to keep him within those limits:—the moment in which such pressure was withdrawn being that in which he always showed himself determined to resume whatever he had appeared to relinquish. Nor was it by such acts only that Charles taught his subjects to regard him as a prince not to be trusted. If he did not avow the favourite maxim of his father—that to rule by craft is indispensable to ruling well—it is certain that he never ceased to act as though guided by that notion, his public declarations and proceedings, with hardly an exception, and, even to the last, being contemporaneous with secret correspondence and negotiations by which they were falsified. Even on the scaffold he expressed himself on the subject of popular government, in terms which show that he died as he lived, swayed by sentiments alien from some of the most essential elements of the English constitution. ‘Sovereign and subject,’ he observed, ‘are clean different things;’ all government being a matter belonging to the former, and ‘in nothing pertaining to the latter.’

So much more important had the middle class in England become during this reign, that the nation was in no temper to sub-

mit even to those more moderate exercises of the prerogative which had been sometimes resorted to by the less arbitrary of our princes; but Charles, in defiance of this spirit, was not content to take his precedents from the most lawless of his predecessors, but would have raised the exceptions supplied by such occasional inroads of the prerogative into the place of the rule provided by law. Concessions, indeed, were at length made, but they were made so late, with so much visible reluctance, and in connexion with so many indications of bad faith, as to cause it to be no matter of surprise with any reflecting man, that each in its turn became no more than a point from which still further demands were to be made. Whenever parties have proceeded to such lengths as Charles and the leaders of the Long Parliament had done, even before the sword was unsheathed, *all ground for mutual confidence having failed*, there can be no hope of a settlement, except by means of conquest on the one side or subjection on the other. The opponent that cannot be trusted must be rendered harmless.

We cannot conclude without a parting word to Von Raumer and his translators. Our professor himself is not blameless in allowing these volumes to appear in an English dress. The view which they afford of English history may not be without its use in Germany, but a little reflection should have sufficed to convince the author that the English reader is by no means in want of the assistance which he has here proffered him, guides of much greater competency being already at the service of such persons. And, speaking generally of Von Raumer's ability, we should say that, could he be content to become more the *forgotten* of the reviews, the magazines, and the newspapers; could he be prevailed with to separate himself to some less extended subject than the History of Modern Europe; and could he be brought to think it not beneath him to treat some less ambitious theme in a less ambitious manner—in the full and sober style of the true historian, and not in this loose fashion which is thought to be philosophical, we should then venture to promise him a more creditable reputation than he now possesses, and one much more permanent than he is at present likely to obtain.

But Von Raumer's translators are greater delinquents in this matter than himself. They, at least, must know how much they have been catering for a childish love of novelty in the circle which is known by the name of 'the little vulgar;' instead of employing their capabilities in introducing the English scholar to some of those truly great men with which Germany abounds. The intelligent English student will remember the labours of Mr. Talboys, of Oxford, with admiration and gratitude, when those of Mr. Lloyd, and, we are sorry to add, of Mrs. Austin, as expended on 'Letters' about England, and on this 'Political History,' will long have been forgotten.

- Art. V. 1. *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, held at the Congregational Library, Finsbury Circus, London, May 9th, 10th, and 13th, 1836; together with the Report of the General Committee, and other Documents connected with the Transactions of the past Year.* 8vo. pp. 32. London.
2. *Account of the Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Session of the Baptist Union, held in London, June 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 24th, 1836; with the Report of the State of the Denomination; the Annual Letter to the Churches, and an Appendix.* 8vo. pp. 68. London.

THE contemptuous indifference with which the clergy and gentry of the Established Church have been heretofore wont to regard the nonconformist denominations confounded under the vague name of Dissenters, is beginning to give place, in the minds of the more intolerant, to feelings of angry alarm at the array they are now found to present; and, in those of the more liberal members of the Establishment, to a more bland and condescending curiosity. So complete has been the separation produced by the church and state system between the established and non-established sections of the Protestant community in this country, holding substantially the same faith—the non-intercourse laws framed by sacerdotal bigotry have been so faithfully observed under the influence of the bigotry of *fashion*—that, of the religion of the Dissenters, the greater part of those who profess and call themselves Churchmen, have remained almost as ignorant as of the religion of Tibet or Japan. Some instances that we could give of the utter want of information prevailing among the higher classes, upon this subject, would scarcely be credited. Mr. Pitt is reported to have inquired upon one occasion, whether all the Dissenters were Socinians; and another prime minister, whom we do not feel at liberty to name, inquired not long ago of a deputation, how Dissenters' marriages were *now* conducted! A county member expressed his astonishment, some time back, at learning that Dissenters had any theological academies. We have been credibly informed of instances in which curiosity has been expressed to *see* a Dissenter; as if the sectarian mark were to be visibly detected in the features! And we shrewdly suspect that, among the 'gowned rabble' of Oxford, who testified their obstreperous orthodoxy by their hisses and groans at 'the Dissenters,' few had much more distinct or intelligent notions of what the term really denotes. In fact, Dissenters have been regarded less as a sect than as a caste, whom it was all very well to tolerate as hewers of wood and drawers of water, but a very vulgar thing to have any knowledge of, much more to be seen in their company.

The British and Foreign Bible Society has, no doubt, in many circles, lessened the force of the unintelligent prejudice against the Dissenters; not merely by bringing pious members of the Establishment into personal contact with good men of other denominations, but also by affording opportunities for the display of an ability and eloquence on the platform, that were previously confined to the narrower though more elevated sphere of the pulpit. In public speaking, eminent Dissenting ministers have been unexpectedly found to possess much the advantage over the majority of the clergy, who are disqualified by their defective theological education, and by the trammels of their ecclesiastical habits, for the free and extemporaneous eloquence that commands attention in the senate or at the bar. Of late years, indeed, pulpit eloquence has been much more favourably estimated and sedulously cultivated within the pale of the Establishment than formerly; to which the necessity of vying with the Dissenting preachers has not a little contributed.

Other circumstances have conduced to inspire a more respectful estimate of the talent to be found in the Dissenting body, as well as of their relative strength and political importance; but, of their ecclesiastical institutions, their theological tenets, their peculiar views, modes, and principles, all that distinguish them in a religious point of view from churchmen, the most vague and inaccurate notions yet prevail even among persons otherwise well informed. The very appellations that historically distinguish them, as Presbyterian, Independent, or Congregational, General or Particular Baptists, are regarded as the cabalistic terms of sectarianism, which it is scarcely worth while to take the trouble to understand. We cannot, indeed, say much in favour of the euphony of our denominational nomenclature. That same uncouth adjective, which is now creeping into use, belongs to what Southey would term the *uglyography* of names. Nor is the term congregational much more happy. The different technical use of the same familiar words, is a source of still greater perplexity. Basil Hall complains of the difficulty he had, in making himself understood by the people of the United States, on account chiefly of the different associations respectively attaching, in America and in England, to the same phrases. He seems to have been puzzled as much by the American acceptance of the term *state*, for instance, as some Episcopalians are by the dissenting acceptance of the word *church*. When the *soi-disant* churchman speaks of going to church, he means the parish building so denominated. When, however, he uses the phrase, 'Our Church,' 'The Church,' or 'Mother Church,' he means, not the parish church, but 'the Church as by law established,' and which he deems part and parcel of the constitution of these realms. But he hears Dissenters speak of their churches,—'congregational churches;' and, as he

knows that their meeting-houses are not so denominated, he is at a loss to understand what sort of a church that can be, which is neither an architectural one, nor a political one, nor any thing answering to the ideas *he* has been accustomed to attach to the hallowed appellation. It will scarcely occur to him to recollect, (nor, if it does, will it strike him as very natural), that, in one of the articles of his church—who reads the articles?—a church is defined as ‘a congregation of faithful men.’ What sort of a church *that* must be, he has probably never reflected.

The word church is used by Dissenters very much in the sense in which it was employed by the framers of the Anglican articles; yet Dissenters distinguish between a church and a congregation. How is this! The Editor of the *Christian Observer*, in a recent number of that publication, has dilated at considerable length upon this conventional distinction, which is stigmatized as ‘non-scriptural,’ ‘presumptuous,’ and ‘delusive.’* It may be worth while, therefore, to offer a few words in explanation of the circumstance so very harshly animadverted upon.

That ‘the church, in scripture, means the congregation of the faithful, and the congregation of the faithful means the church,’ we are fully prepared to admit; and we regret that Tyndale’s honest vernacular rendering of the Greek word, ἐκκλησία, was ever set aside by the pedant king for the ‘juggling’ term, church. As both words may be indifferently used, and have the same import, ‘a church and congregation’ would seem to be tautological, as denoting one thing, rather than conveying a distinction. With such tautology, by the way, legal phraseology abounds, the second term being generally designed to fix more precisely the meaning of the first. We by no means feel sure that the nonconformist phrase, ‘church and congregation,’ had not a similar origin, and that, the word church being equivocal, congregation was not added to mark the sort of church intended. The phrase ‘congregational church,’ is equally tautological, in itself considered; and had the word church retained its primary meaning, it could not have been necessary so to qualify it as implying a collective body, a church composed of a congregation. But, though the two words are strictly convertible, as representing the Greek term in one of its senses, they are not both equally adapted to express every sense of the word ἐκκλησία, which may undoubtedly mean either an assembly of any kind, a body of persons congregated, or an organized congregation, a society. Now the latter is what is generally understood by the term church. It is more than a congregation of hearers or an assembly of worshippers accidentally collected: it is a society of persons accustomed and

* *Christian Observer* for September, 1836, p. 549.

agreeing so to associate and assemble, under their recognized officers. But, as the public assembly is not confined to members of the organized society, the rest of the hearers or worshippers are included under the term, congregation; meaning thereby, the remainder of the customary assembly.

Thus explained, the tautology vanishes; and nothing very offensive would seem to be implied by the distinction which has grown into usage. Our Christian Observer, however, will have it, that this distinctive use of the word church is very unscriptural. 'By what text,' he demands, 'does a dissenter prove that the church is a body distinct from the congregation? And if no text can be found that proves it, by what right, upon his own principles, is this non-scriptural invention introduced into the Church of Christ?' It is pleasant to be thus challenged by a church-and-state man to justify our usages by scripture authority; and we readily take up the glove.

Of course it cannot be meant, that we are to produce a text by which any *etymological* distinction between church and congregation is recognized. To ask this, would be sheer trifling. But a text suggests itself, which will sufficiently answer our purpose, and which we shall transcribe. It occurs 1 Cor. xiv. 23: 'If, therefore, *the whole church* be come together into one (place), and all speak with tongues, and there come in those who are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?' Now we presume that, by 'the whole church (*ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη*), who are here described as convening *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, it will be admitted that we must understand a collective body accustomed so to assemble, not the assembly itself. It must have been an *ecclesia* before it met in *cætu sacro*. Yet, at ver. 18 of the eleventh chapter of this epistle, we find the word 'church' used in the sense of an assembly*—*συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*. Upon this passage, Dr. Bloomfield remarks:—'Expositors are not agreed whether *ἐκκλησία* means *ecclesiā* or *cætu*, i. e., assembly. The former interpretation is maintained by Grotius, Fuller, and Mede. . . . There is more reason to suppose (with most of the recent commentators) that the expression means *cætu (sacro)*, *conventu*, assembly: a sense more suitable to the Apostle's argument; which is to warn them against dissensions in an assembly met together for the worship of God. Besides, *συνερχ. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ* here cannot well differ in sense from the repetition of the same thing, *συνερχ. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, at ver. 20, which can only be understood of the 'assembly.' Here, then, we have clearly the church as a body distinct from the assembly or congregation. Into the latter, those who were not of the church, *ἰδιῶται*, persons uninstructed in

* So *ἐκκλησία* is used, Acts xix. 39.

Christianity, and ἄπιστοι, heathen strangers, might enter; and they might remain so as to form part of the assembly; and they might repeat their attendance and frequent the assembly, if disposed to do so. We beg to ask, whether their even becoming a customary part of the congregation, supposing them to have made no open profession of their having embraced Christianity, would entitle them to be regarded as a part of the *ecclesia*. Our Christian Observer will scarcely maintain the affirmative; and he is therefore bound to admit that we have met his challenge. We have produced a text which shows that Dissenters, in distinguishing between *ecclesia* and *ecclesia*, in its different acceptations, represented by the words church and congregation, have not introduced any non-scriptural invention into the Church of Christ.

But we are told, it is either presumptuous or futile 'to restrict *the congregation* to attendants on divine worship, baptized or unbaptized, and *the church* to a body of persons who are not *the whole church outwardly and visibly*.' We admit that, 'if intended to discriminate which members of an auditory are the true spiritual Israel of God, and which are not, the distinction would be presumptuous;' but such is *not* the intention; nor could any person acquainted with the usages of Dissenters, nor any candid observer, suppose this to be the case. The distinction marks nothing beyond a fact; it recognizes, as in close connexion with the *ecclesia*, or society, a stated congregation of attendants who, from a variety of reasons, have not joined the society. They may be of another communion; they may be occasional attendants; they may decline a closer connexion. To suppose, as this Christian Observer appears to do, that Dissenters use the term congregation as one of 'moral classification'—of 'unchristian exclusionism,' implying 'those who are without,' is more than erroneous; it is disingenuous; because the very way in which the terms 'church and congregation' are associated, and the word congregational is employed, proves that no such idea is conveyed by the distinction. The church forms part of the congregation—is included in it; and it is by ellipsis that those who are not members of the society are denominated the (rest of the) congregation.

Not content with founding upon his own blunders this charge against the Dissenters, our Christian Observer proceeds to quarrel with them for presuming to use the word church at all, in describing their religious societies; on the ground, that 'it is invidious, as respects other bodies of Christians, and especially where *there is an established church*.' He complains that the expression, the church at Hounslow, or the church at Hemel Hempstead,*

* The phrase 'the church of Hemel Hempstead,' which, the writer says, he met with in a tract, must, we are persuaded, have been a typographical

virtually unchurches and excommunicates all who do not belong to that particular society. By parity of reasoning we must suppose, that, when St. Paul sent his salutation to the church in the house of Nymphas (Col. iv. 15), or in that of Philemon, or of Priscilla and Aquila (Rom. xvi. 5), he thereby excommunicated all who did not belong to those Christian companies! Dissenters are not accustomed, indeed, even to use the phraseology here attributed to them, but to designate 'the church' referred to, as meeting in such a chapel, or in such a place, or by some other adjunct, to qualify the term employed. All the alleged 'invidiousness' of the phrase is attributable to entire misapprehension. In fact, it is difficult to acquit the writer of something worse; so easy would it have been for him to ascertain the utter groundlessness of his representation. We know no class of Baptists, Independents, or other dissenters, who ever affected to confine salvation, or the visible church, to their own narrow communion, and to abandon all others to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Bigotry exists in all communions; but not such popery as this.

The Christian Observer would fain, however, lay claim, on behalf of *his* church, to a more enlarged liberality, because all persons are considered as belonging to it, and comprehended in it, who have been baptized, *dissenters always excepted*. 'The Jewish congregation,' we are reminded, 'was the mass of circumcised persons, and the Christian congregation is the mass of baptized persons, not being virtually, voluntarily, and judicially excommunicated. Whether, being thus members of an outward and visible church, they are also truly and spiritually members of Christ's mystical body, must be determined on far other grounds.' Now, as to the superior liberality exhibited in this use of the word church, as including the mass of society, it will be sufficient to advert to the fact, that it is precisely on a par with that of the papists, who are still more anxious to extend their pale as wide as possible, while they allow of no salvation beyond it. But, while thus charitable in her judgment of all who conform, it so happens that this tolerant church of England has always managed to exclude from 'the visible church' the greater number of pious believers in this country, who have fallen under her 'virtual or judicial' anathemas. Let us now examine the scriptural authority for this use of the term *ecclesia*.

There is no question that this word is occasionally employed in the New Testament to denote the universal fellowship of believers,

error. Such a phraseology as, the church *of* such a place, or even 'the Baptist church *of* such a place,' or 'the Congregational church *of* such a place,' is at variance with the universal practice of the dissenters; so that all the writer's pathetic declamation, built on the contrary assumption, falls to the ground.

the body of Christ, the 'holy nation.' We meet also with the expression, 'the church of God at Corinth,' the 'church at Jerusalem,' the 'church of the Thessalonians;' denoting all the believers in those cities. According to this use of the word, the church at London would imply all the faithful residing in the British metropolis; and the church in England would include 'all that are sanctified in Christ Jesus' throughout this country. The Christian Observer contends that all the baptized should be comprehended within the church. Well, then, do we find Episcopalians ever employing such language as this—'the church of God in London,' or 'in Liverpool,' or 'in England,' meaning 'the mass of baptized persons' professing Christianity, of the various denominations? The validity of nonconformist baptism has been acknowledged: are baptized nonconformists recognized as part of the church—the national church? Not by *churchmen*. Then what becomes of the argument drawn from the parallel between the Jewish congregation and the Christian congregation? If Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Moravians, Wesleyan Methodists, do not visibly belong to the Christian congregation, they are not Christians. Nevertheless, strange to say, they do not belong to the national church! And yet, here is a Church of England writer finding fault with Dissenters for distinguishing between the church and the congregation of the faithful, such a distinction being, he says, presumptuous and unscriptural, while the constant usage of his own communion '*unchurches*' every congregation of faithful men that does not conform to the ecclesiastical polity of Queen Elizabeth!

So much for the writer's consistency. Will he excuse us, if we now turn his own words upon himself, and, changing the terms, admonish him, that 'if the *churchman*, 'by the word 'church, does not mean abstractedly God's church, but his own 'ecclesiastical society, for admission into which such and such tests have been agreed upon, then we find no fault with his using his best judgment in laying down rules, and deciding, with charity and sobriety, upon character and qualification, for he ought to do so; *but he ought not to limit scriptural words to this conventional proceeding.*'

When Dissenters speak of the Church of Christ, of the Catholic Church, they assuredly never for a moment confine their thoughts to their own communion; nor do they contemplate it as circumscribed by any political boundaries, nor as defined by any ritual modifications, nor as composed of any ecclesiastical societies. The Church Catholic is not the aggregate of churches, national or congregational, but of believers united severally and vitally to their Divine Head. If Dissenters do not and cannot acknowledge an establishment to be a scriptural church, they do not the less readily recognize as members of Christ's church all the pious

within its communion. They deny that the church of England is the church of God—that it forms any part of it: it is the church of man, the church of the king, a political corporation, an ecclesiastical polity, a state apparatus, a worldly society. To draw the line between ‘what is the church and what is not’—between the church and the world—may be difficult in times like these, when the boundary of Christian profession becomes so indeterminate. But, if the Establishment is the church, where is the world? They are identified. Dissenters do not imagine that any ‘ecclesiastical line of demarcation’ can altogether coincide with ‘the line of spiritual demarcation;’ or that the subtile spirit of the world can be excluded from any sacred inclosures; but their societies are at least founded upon the principle of a distinguishing sanctity of character, and have no other object than to promote it. Scriptural in their constitution, and purely spiritual in their design and aim, they present the nearest approximation that human infirmity admits, to the primitive ‘communion of saints.’ Still, ‘churches of Christ’ as they claim on this ground to be deemed—in which respect they have the advantage over political corporations or state churches,—these congregations do not, strictly speaking, *constitute* any part of THE CHURCH CATHOLIC, which is composed of no ecclesiastical organization, but of living stones, laid by the Great Architect, each and all mysteriously united to the Divine Corner-stone. Of this Church, and of this only—visible in no rites of worship, but only in the lives of the faithful, represented by no forms of polity, uttering its voice in no synods, recognizing no human head, peculiar to no country, or nation, or age—of this only Dissenters speak, without reference to any institutions of their own, when they employ the general term, or more commonly, the specific phrase, THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

Very different is the practice of Episcopalians; and here, more than perhaps on any other point, the language of churchmen and dissenters will be found to betray a significant difference of religious dialect. When the former speak of THE CHURCH, rarely, if ever, do they intend the church catholic. No; it is OUR church,—the national church. But are the whole congregation of baptized persons within its pale referred to under this designation? Far from this being the case, the mass of baptized persons are the subjects of that church, who owe her fealty and homage. ‘The church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.’ This is obviously a church of which the people—the congregation—form no part: it is something quite distinct from the body of Christ. The term church is not here used in a concrete sense, as when denoting the aggregate of believers, but in an abstract sense, for which Scripture affords neither precedent nor countenance. OUR church is, in fact, no other than a magnificent abstraction, clothed with mysterious and all

but divine attributes, the Alma Mater, the Isis of the churchman's imagination, towards whom he often discovers a scarcely less idolatrous fondness than the papist shows for his Madonna. To this all-holy, all-perfect queen-regent are ascribed acts of authority and beneficence as real as can be performed by human agents. Is it asked, who ordained the rites and ceremonies of the episcopal worship? The answer is, The church. Who composed the creeds and articles? The church. '*She*,' we are told, 'has framed and set up, and surrounded by the highest human sanctions, a pure and scriptural standard of doctrine, and all the needful formularies connected therewith.*' *She* has done all that in her lay, by her creeds, rubrics, and canons, to save men; and, if people are deluded by taking the language of her formularies in a more absolute sense than *she* intended, and according to their obvious import, 'the crime is not *hers*.' *She* can do no wrong. In this way are human authority and human sagacity enthroned in the very temple of God.

It may be urged, that this is mere figurative language, harmless metaphor. But if idolatry itself commenced with the worship of emblems and the deification of abstract ideas, it is very possible that anti-christian error may lurk under the flowers of rhetoric. Between *this* idea of the church, which makes its essence to consist in church polity, and the scriptural idea of the church, which is that of a spiritual society, the distinction is as wide as between truth and error; nor could this be more strikingly apparent than in the different shapes which either allegorical personage assumes. In the New Testament, the church of Christ is symbolically portrayed as a chaste virgin, the affianced bride of the Lamb, awaiting the day which shall present her to her Lord. How different is the idea conveyed by this beautiful symbol, from that of a venerable matron, issuing edicts, and demanding homage and obedience! The former personification is designed to express the passive and feminine qualities of subjection, dependence, chastity, devotion: the latter, those of authority, prerogative, antiquity, prescriptive right. The one is the symbol of the universal congregation of worshippers, the innumerable company gathered out of every nation, and kindred, and people: the other is the symbol of secular power and sacerdotal domination over God's heritage. No language approaching to that in which the churchman does homage to the ideal object of his veneration, is ever used by the sacred writers in speaking of the body of Christ. In the New Testament, the church pays homage, but never receives it. In her mystic character she has no power or authority, nor is any claimed for her. In the words of Hooker, 'so far forth as

* *Essays on the Church*, p. 165.

'the church is the mystical body of Christ and his invisible spouse, it needeth no external polity.*' It is not then, nor can be, the spouse of Christ that claims the power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. It is 'a body politic' which alone admits of these ideas. Once more, in the scriptural prosopopœia, the unity and catholicity of the church are the principal features of the allegory. That unity and catholicity are destroyed by giving personality to a part, instead of the whole; and a national church, so personified, becomes the very incarnation of schism. Instead of one church, having the Lord for its only Head, we have presented to us a goodly company, not of virgins, but of mothers, wedded to the rulers of this world, and dowried with its possessions. These mother churches cannot be looking for the Bridegroom: from Him they have nothing to expect. They are institutions of this world, and with the fashion of this world will pass away.

Oh, what a subtle magic do abstractions exert over the strongest minds, when they become enshrined as the idols of the intellect! How far is the pious churchman from suspecting that, in boasting of his church, he is the dupe of a popish fallacy, which has given the name of Christ's body to a thing of worldly elements. Let him analyze his idea of 'our church'—that church which he is perpetually affirming to be in danger—that church which clings so fondly to the state; into what will it resolve itself?—Church government. What is episcopacy? A form of church government. What is the Establishment? A scheme of church governments. We tell the churchman plainly, that the object of his fond idolatry, before which he would have all dissenters fall down prostrate, as before the golden image in the plain of Dura, is nothing more nor less than a scheme of ecclesiastical polity, an empty frame-work of government. Government is an excellent thing, worthy of all reverence; but what has the church to do with it? 'Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so it shall not be among you.†' There is the authority of a witness, and the rule of a teacher; a moral authority and pastoral rule properly belonging to Christ's ministers. But government is a political thing; and, whether exercised by monarch or pontiff, prince or prelate, parson or magistrate, is the same in kind. It may be called ecclesiastical or spiritual, when administered by ecclesiastics; but the power of a bishop is every whit as political, as secular, as earthly as that of a lord lieutenant or lord chief justice. Such government is no element of Christian institutions: it belongs to Cæsar alone.

* Eccl. Pol., Book iii. § 11.

† Mark x. 42.

Church government ought to mean, the government of the church; but when the church is a political body, the government of that body must be by political means. 'The means of civil society,' Warburton remarks, 'are *coercive power*, which power the religious hath not:' and he argues, that 'the administration of each society is exercised in so remote spheres, that they never can meet to clash.' An Establishment, however, is a political institution, based on coercive power. Ecclesiastical courts differ in no respect but their unconstitutional character, from courts of exchequer or common law. The business of such courts is purely secular; the means adopted, precisely as compulsory as in civil proceedings. In fact, the church being identified with the state, and coextensive with the nation, the government of the church must be the same thing with the government of the nation; and a nation can be governed only by political authority. A church may claim to manage its own affairs; but, if those affairs are political affairs, involving national interests, they cannot be withdrawn from the cognizance of the civil magistracy. An established clergy are nothing but an order of magistracy holding of the crown. Of such a church, the king is the only legitimate head, 'unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain.*' Dissenters freely admit, that it is the just prerogative of princes, 'that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers.' In this respect, they recognize no distinction between clergy and laity, between ecclesiastical and civil. As soon as a church becomes a corporation, it is a creature of law; and its religious objects cannot alter the fact, that it is a political institution, coming as such under the cognizance of the state.

The church government of the Dissenters has, on the contrary, nothing in it of a political character, because their churches are not political corporations. This is the glory and the reproach of nonconformity! They have no hierarchy, no church-courts, no synod, *no church!* Archbishop Magee is thought to have made a very clever hit when he remarked, that 'the Roman Catholics have a church without a religion; the Dissenters, a religion without a church; but the Establishment has both a church and a religion.†' Take the word church in the sense of a church polity, and it is true, that, while the Roman Catholics have a

* ART. XXXVII.

† Mr. Hall is reported to have admired this saying for its plausibility and cleverness. 'It is false, and yet it seems to contain a mass of truth. It is an excellent stone for a churchman to pelt with.'—Hall's Works, Memoir p. 119.

church, not without a religion, but without an establishment, and the episcopalians of this country have a church with an establishment, the dissenters have neither church nor establishment, but a religion that requires the support of neither. They have churches numberless; as, in other days, there were 'churches throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria,' which, 'walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.*' But they have no church, which they can call 'our church,' and laud and dignify in terms of fervid eulogy, and array in all the majesty of personal attributes. The first Christians were derided by the heathen, because theirs was a poor, beggarly religion, without a temple, without altar, without a priesthood, without a church! The reproach has descended to the nonconformists of these latter days. If, by a church, we must understand what the churchman understands by his 'mother church,'—a power and domination over the churches which Christ has not set up or authorized,—an abstract church lording it over the churches collective,—a *political totality* fatal to the spiritual character and independence of all the parts, and warring against the catholicity of Christ's body,—then may it ever be the glory of Dissenters, that they do not form a church, have not such a church, and cannot have. Far better to exist as mere scattered, isolated fragments of the mystical body of Christ, which, as such, 'needeth no external polity.'

Some of our Christian observers, however, have taken it into their heads, that Protestant Dissenters have begun to be dissatisfied with this state of things; and that the formation of the Congregational and Baptist Unions, is the result and symptom of this dissatisfaction. They imagine it to be an incipient movement on the part of the ecclesiastical atoms of dissenterism towards organization. We must transcribe the amusing remarks of the Christian Observer upon this head.

'The Independents, or Congregationalists, have lately shown, that, with all their abstract preference for a rope of sand above a well-cemented system of ecclesiastical regimen, they find that some agglutination is desirable; and accordingly, though reprobating presbyteries, synods, and, above all, episcopal jurisdiction, they have invented a new species of machinery, under the name of 'The Congregational Union of England and Wales;' which has regular conferences in London, and holds an 'Annual Assembly,' or Synod—or, to use its own ecclesiastical word, 'Convocation' ('our Great Convocation!')—from which it issues addresses 'to the ministers and churches of the same faith and order throughout the empire;' advising, exhorting, in-

* Acts ix. 31.

structing, or rebuking, as it judges fit, upon the most minute matters of doctrine and discipline. What is this but a virtual abandonment of the independent principle? what is it but the formation of an ecclesiastical œcumenical council? for, though no authority is claimed, and the advice and remonstrances of the 'Convocation' profess to be fraternal, not judicial, yet the very issuing of such an address by such a body is an assumption of jurisdiction; and it implies, contrary to the first law of the Independent system, that it is not desirable that each congregation should be abandoned altogether to its own wisdom and discretion. The dominion of the church of Rome itself grew up by steps as specious, and usurpations at first as unalarming; nay, to this hour the sovereign pontiff professes to be only the servant of the servants of God. A few leaders and delegates meet in a metropolis; they consult together, and issue encyclical letters to their provincial brethren: after a time their power is sensibly felt; enthralment commences, and independence ceases: for though its name may continue a little longer, the influence of the convocation will begin to press increasingly, even to the remotest members: to resist its wishes will become impracticable; to rebel, would be to incur a weight of odium far too heavy for an individual or an isolated society to sustain: the societies will therefore no longer be isolated, but become planets revolving round a central orb: in a word, the congregational system will merge into a system resembling that of the presbyterians, the methodists, the quakers, or some yet stricter rule.'

We agree with a writer in the *Congregational Magazine*, who has called the attention of his brethren to this jesuitical attack,* that the mischievous purpose of the paragraph is too apparent to be mistaken. It can have been with no friendly view towards Dissenters, that this sneering gentleman counsels the 'congregationalists' to look with a very jealous eye at a central convocation, and to send back its addresses unopened. Had he really thought it likely to be 'a death-blow to congregational independence,' he would have sounded no alarm, betrayed no angry jealousy, indulged in no witless sarcasms. If the Protestant Dissenters read this paragraph aright, they will see in it the ill-concealed alarms of an enemy, wishing to excite jealousy and to perpetuate isolation among them; and they will gather from it additional reasons for upholding a Union which, even in its infant state, has been thought to bode no good to systems of a worldly and compulsory nature.

The writer's vulgar caricature of Congregationalism, betrays at once his ignorance and his bad faith. Congregational Unions, instead of being an innovation, are as old as Congregationalism itself. Instead of being 'a virtual abandonment of the inde-

* *Congregational Magazine*, October, 1836, p. 626.

'pendent principle,' they are the consistent and natural result of that principle. The proofs of this statement are so numerous and accessible, that there is no room for doubt or difference of opinion. No sooner had the Independent divines of the Westminster Assembly assumed the form of a distinct denomination, than they issued a 'Declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the congregational churches in England, agreed upon at a meeting of 200 elders and messengers at the Savoy, convened by circular invitations, in December, 1658. The Baptists had put forth a confession of faith as early as 1620. In the preface to the Savoy Declaration, the lawfulness and propriety of holding such conventions in cases of difficulty or difference, is asserted; provided that such synods are not regarded as invested 'with any church power properly so called,' or with 'any jurisdiction' over any churches or persons, so as to warrant their imposing their determinations on the churches or their officers. When the presbyterian and congregational ministers of the metropolis united in 1691, they issued a declaration of their faith, under the title of 'Heads of Agreement,' which appears to have met with very general adoption. The wish to impose these terms of agreement, is expressly disclaimed. 'All pretence to coercive power,' it is explicitly stated in the preface, 'is as unsuitable to our principles as to our circumstances.' The purpose was, to maintain 'harmony and love' among the churches, by promoting a closer Congregational Union. Accordingly, in the same year, a general meeting of the ministers of Devonshire was held at Topsham, of which the eminent John Flavel was chosen moderator; at which the ministers present declared their full satisfaction with the Heads of Agreement, and their thankfulness to their brethren in London. A similar meeting of the United Brethren of Gloucester, Dorset, Somerset, and Devon, was held at Taunton, in the September following. A meeting of the dissenting ministers of the county of Southampton was held at Fareham in the same year; on which occasion Mr. Samuel Chandler preached a sermon, which was afterwards published, 'On the Nature and Advantages of a General Union among Protestants.' Similar associations were formed in Cheshire, Lancashire, and other parts. In the year 1741, we find Dr. Doddridge dedicating a sermon to the associated ministers of Norfolk and Suffolk; and Mr. Harmer, the learned author of the 'Illustrations,' remarks upon this fact, that 'the practice is not only consonant to the Agreement of 1691, but is founded on the nature of things, and is agreeable to the avowed sense of our old Congregational divines.' The 'Communion of Churches' is the subject of a distinct chapter in Dr. Owen's Treatise on the 'True Nature of a Gospel Church;' and his language affords decisive

evidence of the views of the founders of Independency.* In further proof that the principle of '*consociation*' has been a distinguishing feature of Congregationalism, we might appeal to the constitution and practice of the American congregationalists; to the '*Platform of Church Discipline*,' agreed upon at a synod assembled at Cambridge (Mass.), in 1648; and to the associations of churches which have ever since been kept up in New England. In short, no one who has any acquaintance with the religious proceedings of the Independent and Baptist denominations in this country, can be ignorant of the fact, that county Unions, and district associations of ministers and churches, have always existed among them; that the practice of holding annual conventions, and issuing '*encyclical*' letters to the associated churches, is of very long standing; and that the Congregational Union, instead of being '*a new machinery*,' is nothing more than the exhibition on a larger scale, of that union which has always more or less been maintained among our churches.

The only novelty in the plan of either Union, is its being a *denominational* one, or embracing the churches of each denomination throughout the kingdom. Had not such a union already subsisted *in fact*, any scheme for producing it must have proved wholly abortive. But circumstances had previously led to so general and so intimate a combination among the churches of each body, for the support of societies and institutions in which they had a common interest, that it only remained to make a formal declaration of the unity thus ascertained to exist, or to give a more outward and visible form to the spirit and principle of union. Nothing has contributed so powerfully to produce this unity of feeling, and to bind together the members of the general body, as the missionary spirit which has been awakened throughout the religious community, and the amicable rivalry of the several denominations in the great Christian enterprise. Our missionary societies have been rallying points, not of party zeal, but of all the vital energy and genuine piety pervading our respective com-

* '*No church is so independent as that it can always, and in all cases, observe the duties it owes unto the Lord Christ, and the church catholic, by all those powers which it is able to act in itself distinctly, without conjunction with others. And the church which confines its duty unto the acts of its own assemblies, cuts itself off from the external communion of the church catholic; nor will it be safe for any man to commit the conduct of his soul to such a church. . . . That particular church which extends not its duty beyond its own assemblies and members, is fallen off from the principal end of its institution. And every principle, opinion, or persuasion, that inclines any church to confine its care and duty unto its own edification only, yea, or of those only which agree with it in some peculiar practice, making it neglective of all due means of the edification of the church catholic, is schismatical.*'—Owen's '*True Nature of a Gospel Church*,' pp. 250, 251.

munions; and what has thus been drawn, as it were, to a centre, has been sent back again, as a diffusive principle of life, to all the extremities. This reaction of zeal has tended to produce a general revival of religion; so that, in fact, never were our churches in a more healthy state. Admitting that some false excitement may attend the stir and bustle of our public meetings, and the stimulating addresses of the platform, there is nothing illusive in the interest thus created in the great objects to which the united efforts of all Christians are now directed; and the permanent effect cannot, therefore, but be highly beneficial, in familiarizing the mind to wider and more elevated views of the duty and prospects of the church of Christ. In engaging in the work of foreign missions, we have learned, as it were, the lesson of Christianity afresh; and the church has gained strength in the very act of bracing herself for exertion. So completely has the missionary spirit now blended itself with dissenting institutions, that it may be regarded as the vital principle of Dissent, the decay of which would infallibly be followed by the decline and wasting away, or falling to pieces, of the denomination which should be deprived of it. And it is this spirit which more especially constitutes the churches of each denomination one body, operating as a principle of cohesion, or 'bond of peace.' Yet, instead of making each sect more sectarian, it has done more to promote a catholic intercommunion of different sects, than all the forms of concord, or plans of comprehension, that were ever devised.

For many years, the annual meetings of the several missionary societies have exhibited the heart-cheering spectacle of a metropolitan convocation of each denomination; convened, not to decree articles of faith, not to adjust, by a usurped authority, intestine controversies, not to issue canons of excommunication, but to concert or sanction plans for the propagation of the faith of Christ. The London Missionary Society (though not strictly confined to the denomination) has been substantially a congregational union, and the Baptist Missionary Society a baptist union; and out of these annual assemblies or convocations, the unions appear to have naturally arisen. They have grown out of the fraternal feeling called into exercise by these periodical conventions, which has suggested the desirableness of giving a permanent and visible form to the denominational union. The avowed general objects of the Congregational Union are: '1. To promote evangelical religion, in connexion with the congregational denomination. 2. To cultivate brotherly affection and sincere co-operation in every thing relating to the interests of the associated churches. 3. To establish fraternal correspondence with congregational churches, and other bodies of Christians, throughout the world.* That

* The objects of the Baptist Union are stated in similar terms.

these are legitimate objects, cannot be questioned; and as little reason is there to doubt, in our opinion, that these objects are likely to be effectively promoted by the formation of these unions. It has been their fate, however, as it has been that of all good institutions, to be assailed with objections, sneers, and sinister prognostications, from more than one quarter, and upon opposite grounds. We have given a specimen of these, in the uncandid strictures of the *Christian Observer*. Mr. Beverley, in his recent '*Letters on the Visible Church of Christ*,' has attempted to throw ridicule on the Congregational Union, for *not* being a 'machinery of that description which the *Christian Observer* insidiously represents it as likely to become.

'The Congregational Union,' says this gentleman, 'an experiment of very recent origin, cannot be expected to introduce a better order of things; for it is the fundamental rule and principle of this *quasi* parliament, that it shall not, in any case, be considered a court of appeal! I do not seek to scare this assembly in its infancy, with left-hand vaticinations; but I may, perhaps, hint my fears, that a parliament thus ushered into the world, without power and prerogative, and even, in its weakness, so suspected by some, that they keep aloof from it as a stalking horse of despotism, will never be able to do much good to the churches, nor give much trouble to ecclesiastical historians, in recording its illustrious or even its useful deeds. It seems not improbable, that its chief effect will be to congregate numerous Christians, who dare not trust one another to compose the differences, and remedy the disorders of their particular communities. So far from declaring that this assembly shall not be a court of appeal, it ought rather to be determined, that whenever *the majority of a church* desire to appeal to the Union, the appeal shall be heard, and the appellants bound by the decision; taking good care first that the Congregational Union were a full and free representation of the whole body, unbiassed by the preponderance of clerical influence.' Beverley, pp. 216, 217.

There is nothing new in this ill-considered suggestion. Six years ago, Mr. Walter Wilson published some '*Remarks upon the present state of the Dissenting Interest, with Hints for its Improvement by means of a Consolidated Union*;'* in which he strongly urged the adoption of a 'representative system of church government,' or a modified presbyterianism, as one means of 'constituting the dissenting interest one firm and compacted body.' His plan was carefully drawn up, but it met with no better reception than Mr. Beverley's flippant recommendation is likely to obtain from all dissenters who understand their principles. It was objected to, 'first, as avowedly a system, *not of union, but of control*; secondly, as adapted to lead to a rash, busy, and mis-

* *Eclectic Review*. Third Series. vol. v. p. 415.

chievous intermeddling with the concerns of pastors and their congregations ; and thirdly, as tending to *secularize our churches*, and to create a power which has ever been found more mighty for evil than for good.' 'Presbyterianism,' it was added, 'has had its fair trial, and it will not thrive in this country.'

It cannot be too explicitly understood, that the Union (we speak of both the Congregational and the Baptist) is not a *scheme of church government*. Its object is not to set up a church. It is based upon the recognition of the distinctive principle of Congregationalism, that every separate church is complete and independent for the purpose of jurisdiction. All legitimate church power, according to the fundamental principle of Independency, is held to be inclusive in each particular church, and to be limited to it, so as to be incapable of extension or delegation to any synodical convention or representative assembly. In this respect, Dr. Barrow, Lord Chancellor King, Mosheim, Neander, and other high authorities, being witness, the Independent Churches are strictly conformed to the primitive polity.

Any apprehension that the congregational system can 'merge into a system resembling that of the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Quakers, or some yet stricter rule,' can arise only from ignorance of the distinctive features and essential character of that system. Presbyterianism is essentially a system of church polity, resting upon coercive power, and trenching upon the province of civil government. It is not in its forms that it differs from independency, so much as in the nature of the jurisdiction to which it lays claim. The Society of Friends is at once a religious and a political corporation ; the privileges of membership are hereditary ; and its constitution and government present little that is analogous to the churches of the Congregationalists. As to the Wesleyan system, it is further removed, perhaps, from Congregationalism than Presbyterianism itself. Mr. Beverley's picture of Methodism, although too much in the broad style of caricature, is not very far from the truth.

'The Wesleyans do not pretend that their arbitrary oligarchy of priests resembles the order established in the primitive churches. The constitution of John Wesley is an edifice built up entirely by the imagination of man, and, in this respect, has no more claim to our reverence than the fabric of Jesuitism or the government of the Papal hierarchy : it may be useful and clever, and to certain ends may wisely apply certain means, but this is all we can say of it, if we examine it either by the gospel or any decent code of morals ; and it is extremely probable, that persons who understand the trick of government might contrive another constitution more clever and more artful than that which at present 'feels along the line' of Wesleyan Methodism.

'The master secret of the society is the consignment of a boundless power to an oligarchy of clergymen, whilst the people are allowed to

play with the forms of power, in the reality of which they have no share. Conference is a camarilla of priests, who, with closed doors, make all the laws by which the society is regulated, and to the high prerogative of expulsion or suspension of any member of the society, add the still more important one of voting, levying, and applying all the taxes, without consulting the people. In other words, absolute power is vested in the hands of a self-elected oligarchy: a form of government the most arbitrary and powerful that can be imagined, as may be seen by comparing John Wesley's system with the now fallen government of the state of Venice.

With all this apparatus of dominion, there is, however, a large allowance of the forms and semblance of power to the people; they have their district meetings, class-meetings, stewards' and leaders' meetings, and in various other ways are permitted to put forth their energies without opposition, so long as those energies are employed in a way agreeable to their masters. And it is this dexterous arrangement which makes Methodism popular with the multitude; for every one who has any desire to be active may immediately find a field for his activity by taking a part in the complicated business of his sect, and in some way or other may so occupy himself as to appear to his own eyes, at least, of some importance. All the while, however, there is the jealous eye of authority anxiously watching the busy movements of the incorporated workmen; and if perchance they trench on forbidden ground, if they question a decree of Conference, if they demand any reform, or resist any ordinance of their superiors, or even, by remote tendency, seem to desire an enlargement of popular influence, immediately a stern and inexorable Superintendent quashes all their proceedings, and makes them feel that though Conference only sits once, and that for a short time, every year, yet it never slumbers nor sleeps so as to drop the sceptre which it received from John Wesley's hands. In vain is it for the remonstrants to battle out their cause, however clearly justice may be on their side, through all the various courts of appeal which Methodism seems to offer to its oppressed members:—some bar of authority, some interstice of the net of power, embarrasses them at every turn; and, at last, a grand and verbose epistle from Capreæ cuts off the remonstrants, as putrid limbs of the body, and consigns them to the dogs and sorcerers, who are for ever shut out of the walls of Wesleyan Methodism.' pp. 171—173.

We say, then, that any jealousy of the Congregational or the Baptist Union, as a scheme of jurisdiction, is utterly groundless; first, because their constitution does not admit of any jurisdictional power being vested in them; and secondly, because such power is unknown to Independency, nor would any controlling power be submitted to. They are unions, not of ministers, but of churches, represented by their pastors and lay delegates; and it is impossible that their annual meetings should otherwise than faithfully reflect the sentiments and feelings that animate the general body.

Having, we trust, satisfactorily disposed of this insincere or cap-

tious objection, we shall very briefly advert to one or two more of a different description. The most plausible, or at least that which seems the best entitled to respectful attention, is grounded on the idea, that these Unions, being denominational, seem to erect the standard of sectarianism. Many good men, whose liberality of opinion makes them almost feel ashamed of belonging to any particular section of the church of Christ, have even warmly deprecated any plan for giving greater compactness of organization, or more of a visible unity, to the denomination to which they ostensibly belong. We respect the feeling, but regard it as springing altogether from mistaken views. We have already remarked, that the same expansive spirit of missionary zeal, that has tended to knit together, in closer union, the several churches of the same denomination, has also brought into more cordial intercommunion the different denominations. It is a grievous mistake, to imagine that the churches of the same faith and order must, by drawing closer together, separate themselves in mass more widely from other communions. Were it proposed to circumscribe the denomination by new and arbitrary terms of communion, to impose restrictions upon the ministry, to exact conformity to articles of faith or some solemn league and covenant, or to set up any ecclesiastical polity, there might be reason to fear that the effect would be to widen and inflame our sectarian differences. The recent proceedings of the Synod of Ulster hold out a warning in this respect, which may well deter congregationalists from trusting any clerical body with either legislative or jurisdictional powers. But, as regards other denominations, the consolidation of our own union is a step towards a more fraternal correspondence with the other parts of the Christian body.

To establish such a correspondence is, as we have seen, one specific object of the Congregational Union; and the result has justified the expectations of its founders. Bodies of evangelical Protestants heretofore separated by trivial differences and sectarian jealousies, have publicly joined in the mutual recognition of each other as sister communities. A more catholic feeling has been superinduced, before which the rigid rules of ecclesiastical etiquette have given way. We hail these practical concessions as a token for good to the common cause. Little is gained by isolated instances of liberality. Were an Episcopalian of the church of England to recognize in the fullest manner the validity of nonconformist ministrations, by admitting his dissenting brother to his pulpit, and were cases of this liberality to become frequent, and to be connived at by those in authority, we should still have made but small advance to a catholic communion of evangelical denominations. Yet, nothing beyond this seems practicable, till the associated churches of each body are enabled to act as a denomination, and to receive and reciprocate in their

united capacity the fraternal recognition of other protestant bodies. We must be seen to agree among ourselves, before we can invite others to a closer agreement with us. We must organize our own union, before we can hope that any more general approximation to unity can be brought about. We must, in a sense, become more visibly and distinctly sectarian, in order to become ultimately more catholic.

The Baptist Union avow it to be their object, 'to promote unity of exertion in whatever way may best serve the cause of Christ in general, and *the interest of the Baptist denomination in particular.*' This last clause may be thought by some persons to savour of sectarian narrowness: but how can we better promote the cause of Christ, than by promoting the spiritual prosperity and efficiency of any one portion of the Christian body? A cordial attachment to the distinctive principles of our own denomination, and a peculiar anxiety for the religious interests of that section of the church, is perfectly compatible with the most enlarged liberality of feeling towards other communions. Latitudinarians are often the greatest bigots; and of all sectarians, your *no-denomination* men, ecclesiastical non-descripts, are generally found the most schismatical in spirit, the most exclusive in their preferences, and the most peremptory in their opinions. Nothing is gained by the substitution of *cliques* for sects. The most circumscribed denomination is, after all, a wider circle than the little sphere of an ecclesiastical coterie. In the United States, the absence of the artificial distinctions of rank, has led to the arbitrary subdivision of society into a ridiculous and vexatious gradation of *castes*. Something of this kind would be the result, were it possible to break up our sectarian distinctions in the present state of the church: we should only substitute party divisions for denominational ones.

We hear it asked with a sneer, what has the Union done? Its alleged inefficiency is dwelt upon with something like exultation; and in the tone of sarcasm which Mr. Beverley has caught, it is predicted, that ecclesiastical historians will not have much trouble in recording its illustrious or even its useful deeds. In the spirit of Sanballat, these observers of our building are heard exclaiming, 'What do these feeble *dissenters*? Will they fortify themselves?'—In reply to all such sneers and vaticinations, we might refer to the contents of the Reports before us, as showing that the objects of these Unions have been efficiently promoted by the progress which has been made towards collecting statistical information, and organizing a more general combination of effort among the churches, as well as by the demonstration presented to the world, of the substantial unity of sentiment and correspondence of feeling which pervade our deno-

minations. It is something gained, to have wiped away the reproach cast upon our dissenterism, as opposed to all harmonious co-operation or social 'agglutination.' It is something achieved, to have triumphed so far over the antiquated prejudices and ultra-Independent jealousies which have too long kept us from acting up to our principles.

We must confess, that we are not anxious to see a much greater degree of *executive* efficiency exerted by the committees of these Unions. The more rigidly they restrict themselves to the specific business from time to time confided to them by the General Body, the better. The Union can properly *act* only in its annual conventions. In the interim, the objects of the Union will be best carried into effect by means of the district associations throughout the country, to revive and assist whose local operations ought to be one main business of the central committee. Some of these associations may have sunk into a state of inaction and disorganization. In other districts, they yet remain to be formed. In not a few stations of obscure usefulness, faithful ministers are toiling amid many difficulties and discouragements, uncheered by the sympathy and sanction of their brethren. To such individuals the Union will extend a helping hand; and brought into connexion with the general body, they will no longer be depressed by the feeling of isolation. Many have returned to their distant stations from the annual assembly, with gladdened hearts and recruited spirits, thanking God and taking courage from what they have witnessed and participated. But a system of itinerant visitation, such as has been found so beneficial in maintaining the activity of our auxiliary Bible Societies and Missionary Societies, will be indispensably necessary in order to consolidate the denominational Union. The country associations must be visited, and information be obtained by local inquiry. There would be constant employment, in this way, for the undivided labours of a secretary or other officer of the Union, who ought not to be penuriously remunerated for his services. No pastoral charge could be equal in importance to this official trust, or would require more distinguished wisdom, experience, and ability. Being invested with no jurisdictional power, with no authority to bind or to loose, to ordain or to depose, this delegate would exercise no functions at variance with the most rigid principles of Independency. Some of the old nonconformists, indeed, were accustomed to make almost diocesan circuits in visiting the churches which they had planted or watered. Thus it is recorded of the Author of the Pilgrim's Progress, that, 'by the visitations that he made, which were two or three every year, some, though in jeering manner no doubt, gave him the epithet of Bishop Bunyan; while others envied him for his so earnestly labouring in Christ's

'vineyard.' We want *such* bishops as Bunyan; and by such visitations as his, our churches would be richly benefited. But we must not indulge in any further suggestions. What these Unions are destined to effect, will, after all, mainly depend upon the amount and quality of piety, if we may so speak, that shall be thrown into the working of the system. Those plans and institutions come nearest to the arrangements of the Divine wisdom, although the furthest removed from human policy, which depend most absolutely, for efficiency and permanence, upon the living and conservative principle.

Art. VI. *Report of Select Committee on Negro Apprenticeship.*
Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 13th August,
 1836.

THE recent history of Colonial legislation has amply verified the predictions of the abolitionists, and shown the folly of those ill-judging and misguided statesmen, who calculated on the co-operation and honesty of slaveholding law-makers. The uniform procedure of the colonists for some centuries might have preserved reflecting men from expecting any thing like straight-forward and efficient legislation from them. So long since as 1792, Mr. Canning lifted up his warning voice against any such confidence; and in language, not less just than eloquent, said, 'Trust not the masters of slaves in what concerns legislation for slavery! However specious their laws may appear, depend upon it they must be ineffectual in their application. It is in the nature of things that they should be so. Let then the British House of Commons do their part themselves. Let them not delegate the trust of doing it to those who cannot execute that trust fairly. Their laws can never reach, can never cure, the evil. There is something in the nature of absolute authority, in the relation between master and slave, which makes despotism, in all cases, and under all circumstances, an unsafe and unsure executor even of its own provisions in favour of the objects of its power.' But Mr. Canning's warning and the experience of ages were alike disregarded by Lord Stanley and his supporters: and the result has been what every impartial man expected. The apprenticeship system has been so far adopted as was necessary to secure to the colonists the monstrous grant of twenty millions, which in an hour of prodigal liberality the imperial government voted them. Needy and bankrupt planters, together with interested noblemen, merchants, and others, have clamorously demanded their share of the national grant, and have then turned round and insulted the

people of this country by refusing to devise such measures as are necessary to the beneficial working of the new system. Another chapter has been written in the history of evasive and tortuous legislation; the phraseology and the forms of freedom have been employed to conceal the practice of slavery, and thus perpetuate the wrongs which had aroused the indignation of the British public. The statutes which have been passed, in professed conformity with the letter, have grossly violated the spirit of the imperial act; and the negro population, while avowedly invested with new rights, have been mercilessly deprived of a large proportion of the few comforts which they possessed under the old system. A transition state has been created by the humanity of the mother country, which the colonists have endeavoured to render as miserable as was possible, so that it yet remains a problem whether the *present* condition of the negro be preferable to that from which he has emerged.

This state of things was foreseen from the first. The advocates of immediate and entire abolition in the very heat of the struggle, maintained that any scheme which fell short of a complete recognition of the freedom of the slaves, would either be found impracticable, or be administered in the spirit of the old system. They therefore protested both against the apprenticeship and against the power delegated to the colonial legislatures; and when their memorials and petitions were rejected, they threw the whole responsibility of the measure upon the government, and forewarned them of what would follow. Their predictions did not remain long unfulfilled. Information of the most painful character soon reached this country through a variety of respectable channels, stating that slavery was abolished only in name, and that a thousand methods were adopted to annoy and irritate the black population. So strong were the representations made to the friends of the negro, that they again took the field, and at a public meeting held at Exeter Hall, May 15, 1835, resolved, that a committee of inquiry was absolutely necessary, to investigate the state of the *law* and the *practice* under the new system in the colonies. In pursuance of this resolution, Mr. Buxton, June 19, 1835, moved for a committee: but after an interesting debate, he consented to withdraw his motion, in consequence of certain statements made and pledges given by Sir George Grey.

From this period evidence of the sinister policy of the colonists began rapidly to accumulate, and Mr. Buxton was therefore enabled, in the early part of last year, to lay such a case before parliament, as to obtain, on March 22, the appointment of a select committee 'to inquire into the working of the apprenticeship system in the colonies, the condition of the apprentices,

‘and the laws and regulations affecting them which have been passed.’

That committee have directed their attention principally to Jamaica, and have made a report on so much of the evidence laid before them as affects that colony. Their report, and the evidence on which it assumes to be founded, are now before us, and if we followed our own inclinations we should immediately proceed to these documents. We are tempted, however, to defer such an examination to our next number, and in the meantime to employ a few pages in pointing out to our readers the position of the question at the time the committee entered on their inquiry. This is the more important, as it will throw light on the intentions of the British government, and acquaint the English public with the measures which have been adopted to frustrate their benevolent design.

It will be remembered, that when Lord Stanley introduced his resolutions, on which his bill was afterwards founded, to the attention of the House of Commons, he not only explained its principles, but adverted to its details, and the spirit in which he intended it should be carried into effect. We make one extract from his lordship’s eloquent speech, explanatory of his views and intentions, which it will be important to bear in mind.

‘He proposed that every negro should, from that day—or perhaps he ought to have said from the day in which this act should be passed—not after a year or two, but forthwith, be entitled to claim to be put in such a situation as would prepare him to enjoy all the rights and privileges of a free man—a situation in which he would no longer bear about him any taint of a servile condition—in which he would be released from the atrocious system of irresponsible corporal punishment in which he would be in the full enjoyment of all his domestic ties and comforts—in which he would not be compelled to see his nearest and dearest connexions insulted by the whip, or by the threat of the whip—in which his evidence would be received in all courts of justice either for or against his employer, as freely as that of any other of his Majesty’s subjects—in which his right to property, of every description, would be as undisputed as that of any other of the king’s subjects—in which he would enjoy every right and every privilege of a free man, subject only to this restriction, that he should be under a contract to labour for a certain time industriously for his present owner, who would then only be his employer. Perhaps it would be as well for him to meet here the objection, ‘How will you deal with the multitudinous restrictions with which the colonial legislatures have fettered the slave?’ He would sweep away all those restrictions at once *by declaring the negro a free man*. From the moment he was declared a free man, the restrictions which applied to him as a slave would cease to apply to him in his capacity of a freeman. The negro, being no longer a slave, would be entitled to contract marriage; his evidence would be indis-

putable; his right to property would be admitted; he would be entitled to seek the religious instructor he liked best; and, in a word, as he had said before, he would enjoy every privilege of a free man, upon the condition of consenting to labour for a given time upon a particular soil. He could not believe that even if the matter stood thus, and thus only, this proposition could be considered such an infraction on the freedom of labour as would justify or hold out a temptation even to the most eager, the most anxious advocate of unqualified emancipation, to hesitate in giving his assent to the boon of freedom, coupled as it was with such trifling restrictions.'

In conformity with these statements, the twelfth clause of the Slavery Abolition Act expressly declares, 'that all and every 'the persons, who, on the 1st day of August, 1834, shall be holden 'in slavery within any British Colony as aforesaid, shall upon and 'from and after the said 1st day of August, 1834, become and be 'to all intents and purposes free and discharged of and from all 'manner of slavery, and shall be absolutely and for ever manumitted:' subject to the condition of an apprenticeship for a limited period, during which they should be liable, being prædial apprenticed labourers, to perform any labour for their employers not exceeding in the whole, in any one week, forty-five hours. (See clause 5.)

On the 19th of October, 1833, Lord Stanley addressed a circular despatch to the Governors of the Crown Colonies, in which his lordship distinctly states, that his Majesty's government will not allow them to sanction any ordinance imposing greater burdens on the negroes than those of the Imperial Act.

The whole of his lordship's dispatch is important, as fixing the principles and pointing out the spirit in which his Majesty's government expected the colonies would act. His lordship states that,—

'On effecting throughout extensive dominions of the crown so vast a change as that from slavery to freedom, his Majesty's government (and parliament agreeing in their views) deemed it indispensable to provide for a transition state, of longer or shorter duration, but of which they fixed the maximum, during which the present master and slave should continue bound to each other by mutual obligations, securing to the one a limited portion of labour, and to the other a certain maintenance and protection; and the principal objects of these enactments was, to make temporary provision for the continued cultivation of the soil, and good order of society, until all classes should gradually fall into the relations of a state of freedom. Of the obligations of this intermediate condition, some were directly imposed by parliament, some were by the same authority expressly forbidden to be imposed; others again were left within certain limits, to be fixed by the local legislatures. But as these legislatures were expressly authorized to fix the term of this apprenticeship, provided it did not exceed a certain duration, so it is clearly within their province, should they deem it

safe and prudent so to do, to dispense with it altogether, and to pass at once to a state of unrestricted freedom. I do not anticipate the probability, and I should be disposed to doubt the prudence of such a course; but, in the event of the legislative council coming to such a decision, you will not, on that account, hold yourself bound to refuse your concurrence in an ordinance framed upon that principle, as being repugnant to the act of the imperial parliament. But you will distinctly understand, that you will not be authorized to consent to any ordinance creating an intermediate state of a different description, or subjected to the restrictions of a different nature from those contemplated by parliament. The term of apprenticeship may be *shortened*; the hours of compulsory labour may be *fewer*; the burden imposed may be made *lighter*; but no distinctions must be drawn between those at present free, and those at present slaves, of a different character from, or to a greater extent than those which have been sanctioned by parliament. As you will consider yourself precluded, by your instructions, from sanctioning any ordinance which may prolong the duration of the intermediate state, or impose any heavier burdens upon those who are in that state, so you will likewise withhold your sanction from any ordinance perpetuating or continuing after the termination of that period, any distinctions or exclusions arising out of a previous servile condition.'

But how stands the fact? We will not inquire whether the just expectations of the friends of the negroes have been complied with, but whether the moderate requirements of the noble lord have been honestly met.

By the imperial act, the negroes were guaranteed in return for their labour as apprentices,

First, 'Such food, clothing, lodging, medicine, medical attendance, and such other maintenance and allowances as by any law now in force in the colony to which such apprenticed labourer may belong.'

Second, 'The enjoyment, for their own benefit, of that portion of their time during which they are not required to labour in the service of their respective employers.'

Third, Protection from 'any cruelty, injustice, or other wrong or injury which may be done to or inflicted upon any such apprenticed labourer by the persons entitled to their services.'

Fourth, Exemption on the part of the female apprenticed labourer from corporal punishment 'by whipping or beating her person.'

Fifth, The transfer of the power of punishing the apprenticed labourers from the local magistracy, planters, &c., to stipendiary magistrates specially appointed by the crown.

Sixth, Unrestricted liberty of access in their own time to the religious teachers they may prefer.

Seventh, The right to purchase their discharge from apprenticeship, even against the will of their employers.

It will be seen, by the 16th clause of the Imperial Act, that

unless these advantages are fully secured to the negroes, by colonial laws, or orders in council, such laws, or orders in council, are 'declared to be absolutely null and void, and of no effect.'

On the 12th of February, 1834, Lord Stanley announced to the Marquis of Sligo, that 'adequate and satisfactory provision' had been made by law, in the colony of Jamaica, for giving effect to the British act. His Lordship stated, however, at the same time, that his majesty's government had not overlooked the existence of various defects in the act, which had been thus sanctioned. They were aware, also, that by withholding his majesty's approbation of the act, they would have been furnished with an argument, of almost irresistible force, in favour of such amendments and alterations as they might propose. 'But,' adds his lordship, 'although they will not be compelled, by the motives to which I have alluded, to acquiesce in the suggestions which will be offered to them, for the purpose of remedying the imperfections of the act, they will nevertheless receive and adopt them in *that spirit of confidence and good will*, which I trust will henceforth always be found to exist between the colony and his majesty's government!'

How far the Jamaica assembly were entitled to the generous confidence thus reposed in them, might be satisfactorily shown, did our limits permit, by a critical review of their remedial enactments, which professed to meet the suggestions offered by Lord Stanley, in so conciliatory and even so deferential a tone. It may suffice to observe, that all the most important of the propositions—all those which would have been of general application, and have conferred practical benefit on the apprentices, were contemptuously disregarded. In proof of what we advance, we would instance the third suggestion, limiting the master's right of imprisoning his apprentice (a right unceasingly abused) to such cases as would justify, under existing laws, the temporary restraint of persons of free condition. And again the eighth item in his Lordship's list of defects, respecting the appropriation of fines imposed on the master, for wrong and injury to the apprentice, and proposing, that out of those fines, the special magistrate should be empowered to award compensation to the injured apprentice, instead of the whole amount, as at present, being appropriated to the public service.

And lastly, the concluding suggestion, urging the necessity of some specific regulations, bearing the 'strictness of legal obligation,' for enforcing the due and regular supply of food, clothing, &c. during the term of apprenticeship, and which, by the tortuous and treacherous wording of the first act, had been virtually left unprovided for.

These flagrant instances of bad faith, (and they are by no means all that might be quoted), abundantly testify that the confidence,

so courteously expressed, in the integrity of the Jamaica legislators was most miserably misplaced. Yet, defective as was the act in question, and scanty as were its beneficial amendments, it was limited in duration to the 31st of December, 1835.

The Earl of Aberdeen, who was then Colonial Secretary, in his despatch to the Marquis of Sligo, dated 15th January, 1835, noticed the limited time for which it had been passed in the following terms :—

‘ I have great satisfaction in announcing to your lordship, that his majesty has been graciously pleased to accept the act for the amendment of the slavery abolition act, as a satisfactory compliance with the advice conveyed to the local legislature by Lord Stanley in obedience to his majesty’s commands. I remark, however, that the operation of these amendments is, by the final clause, limited to the 31st December of the present year, although the act of which it is an amendment will continue in force till the expiration of the apprenticeship. This is a very serious ground of objection, nor can his majesty’s government consider the legislature of Jamaica as having fully acquitted themselves of the duty to which they were called, until the amendments shall have been rendered as enduring in point of time as are the original enactments.’

How the Jamaica legislature have deserved the confidence thus placed in them, or acquitted themselves of the duty to which they were called, will be seen hereafter. We proceed with our remarks. Not content with the power over the apprentices, which they had secured for themselves, by the acts they had already passed, the Jamaica legislators, true to the principles which had ever governed them, passed a third act, ‘to amend and explain and ‘repeal part of ‘the Slavery Abolition Act,’ and for other purposes,’ which contained provision to render compulsory manumission, already in a great degree neutralized, almost impossible; to deprive the negro of the limited protection allowed him by the two preceding acts; to reintroduce the old system of irresponsible punishment, and the establishment of penal gangs, and other modes of punishment, on estates; still further to vex, irritate, and oppress the negroes, by unwarrantable punishments, interference with conjugal and parental intercourse, suspension of friendly meetings and amusements, and a wanton destruction of the negroes’ property: last of all, to reintroduce the outrageous and disgusting practice of flogging females.

This act unfortunately received the sanction of the Marquis of Sligo, in December 1834, and continued in force until a recent period, when it was disallowed by his majesty’s government, after having inflicted on the apprenticed labourers a vast amount of evil.

When this subject was brought before the House of Commons, in the session of 1835, Sir George Grey said, that the objections properly raised against the first Jamaica act, were remedied by

the second or amending act; and that the third act had been disallowed. On the 31st December the second act expired; and the first act, with all its defects—we should rather say manifest violations of the letter and spirit of the British act—remained the law.

The Marquis of Sligo earnestly recommended the renewal of the second Jamaica act, in the form in which it received the sanction of his majesty, to be in force during the remaining period of the apprenticeship. Did the Jamaica legislature comply with this reasonable request? No. They refused to renew their amending act, unless still farther clogged with such provisions, as would make the condition of the apprenticed labourers worse than it was before their emancipation took place. They actually introduced into it some of the very matter which had been contained in the disallowed act; and this was done, says one of the public prints of the island, in order to show that the assembly is independent, and can do as it pleases!

Another important measure, namely the Police Bill, they refused to pass for a longer period than one year; notwithstanding the powerful reasons adduced, and the urgent solicitations of the Governor in its favour, who declared it to be essential to the safe and satisfactory working of the apprenticeship. It also appears, that clauses restricting the rights and privileges of the apprenticed labourers, to a most unwarrantable extent, were introduced into this bill also; and it was anticipated, that if no other reason existed, this would prove fatal to its becoming law.

‘This kind of legislation,’ says a Jamaica paper, ‘is doubtless considered very proper by some of our wiseacres. Fortunately, there are others to be consulted, the British government and the people, who it appears paid, or agreed to pay, twenty millions to put the negroes into a much worse condition than that in which they previously were. The specimen of enlightened legislation alluded to, is, to use Mr. Leslie’s favourite mode of expression, quite refreshing. It will prove to the philanthropists of Great Britain, the absolute necessity of putting an end to a state of probation, which is daily becoming more irksome and oppressive than the late one of slavery, and to the government the propriety of narrowly scrutinizing every enactment emanating from the legislature of this colony.’

Upon a careful and thorough examination of the subject, it was found, that the law for the government of the apprentices was in the highest degree objectionable. Its character may be gathered from the following statement, submitted to the attention of Lord Glenelg, in a memorial presented by the anti-slavery societies on the 14th August, 1835.

‘The regulations for the purchase by the negro of the remaining term of his apprenticeship, are vague and insufficient.

‘The power placed in the hands of vestries, with regard to the sup-

port of aged and infirm negroes, may be cruelly and unjustly exercised.

‘The regulations respecting the mode of appraisement of the value of the negro, are in a high degree arbitrary and unjust.

‘No remedy is provided for the parent, child, or other relative, who by any omission or mistake of the special justice, shall have been separated from his family !

‘The regulations with respect to food, maintenance, and allowances, are extremely unsatisfactory, and open to great abuse.

‘Enormous discretionary powers are unreasonably confided to single special magistrates ; in some cases, no less than that of dooming to uncompensated servitude, until the age of twenty-one years, every child born of slave parents, not of the age of six years at the commencement of the period of apprenticeship, or born of apprenticed parents any time within it, if adjudged by such magistrate to be not sufficiently provided for.

‘The apprentice may be compelled to work for the benefit of his employer for a longer period than is necessary to indemnify for the loss of time incurred by the apprentice’s absence, extending to three days’ labour for half a day’s absence.

‘Though provision is made to compel the apprentice to indemnify the employer, no provision is made for compelling the master to indemnify the apprentice for loss arising from any act of his.

‘No provision is made with regard to the hours of consecutive rest, which are in all cases essential to the negro ; whereas, as the law now stands, the fifteen hours of extra labour awarded as a penalty, may be so apportioned, as to force the labourer to continue at work for forty-two hours in succession.

‘A single act of inebriety taking place in the apprentice’s own time, may be punished by the forfeiture of four days’ labour for the advantage of his employer.

‘For the indefinite offence of ‘insolence,’ thirty-nine stripes may be inflicted.

‘For the careless use of fire, or the mere cutting off a cane-stalk, the negro may be punished by three months’ imprisonment, or fifty lashes.

‘A power is given to a single special justice to condemn a labourer summarily to six months’ hard labour, for any riot on the part of three or more apprentices.

‘For carrying a knife in his pocket, the apprentice may be punished by thirty-nine lashes, and the forfeiture of the ‘offensive weapon’ to his owner.

‘The enactments relative to the arrest of negroes by estate constables, and the time they may be kept in confinement, are indefinite, and open to great abuse.

‘The negro, for making complaints which may be deemed groundless, may be punished by the forfeiture of double the length of time occupied on the occasion of making them.

‘A special justice may substitute a longer period of solitary confinement for hard labour, than that awarded by the original judgment.

‘Power is given to a single special justice to sentence any apprenticed

labourer, convicted of 'indolence,' 'neglect,' or 'improper performance of work,' in addition to punishment by flogging, hard labour, or solitary imprisonment, to continue at work for any such number of hours or days, in his or her own time, for the benefit of the person entitled to his or her services, 'as the justice of the case may seem to require,' not exceeding fifteen hours in any one week; so that for an act of 'indolence,' or 'neglect,' or 'improper performance of work,' a single special justice may, by possibility, deprive a whole gang of labourers of fifteen hours of their own time in each week, during the whole six years of their apprenticeship, or even beyond that period.

'This extraordinary enactment, which your petitioners conceive would have been sufficient alone to warrant the total rejection of the act, has been passed over, even without observation.

'Your petitioners believe such an unlimited discretion could never have been contemplated; though it is understood, in point of fact, that under this, or similar clauses, punishments have been recommended, if not awarded, within the last year, which are to take effect in 1841.

'Regulations are adopted relative to the removal of apprentices from their provision-grounds, which are both harsh and unjust.

'The regulations with respect to the provision grounds, and the substitution of allowances in lieu of them, are indefinite, and liable to great abuse.

'The enactments relative to the hours of labour are indefinite, and also liable to great abuse, and to the infliction of great hardship on the apprentice.

'The powers given to the special magistrate, as they regard the manager and the apprentice, are unequal and unfair. In the latter case, this power extends to six months' imprisonment, to fifty stripes, to the right of depriving him of fifteen hours' labour in any week during the whole period of the apprenticeship, and also of prolonging that apprenticeship one whole year; whilst his authority over the manager extends only to a maximum penalty of 5*l.* currency, or five days' imprisonment, which he is not *required*, but merely *empowered* to inflict.

'The remedy given to the apprentice, of proceeding against his master by action at common law, is nugatory in his hands, as he has not the funds to enable him to do so.

'The enactments, authorizing the extension of the term of apprenticeship in certain cases, for one whole year, are carelessly worded, and liable to abuse.

'The assessment of damages are left to a *single* special magistrate.'

It is unnecessary to touch specifically on the Jamaica Vagrancy Act, because it has been disallowed. We may, however, observe, that it amounted virtually to an imprisonment of the negroes in their respective parishes; with the perpetual privation of arms, and even of such necessary implements as may be drawn within the mean of 'offensive weapons,' the use of which, and even

of the freeman's right of locomotion, were made to depend wholly on the arbitrary construction of a colonial magistrate. By the restrictions put upon migration, the *time, industry, and talents* of the negroes were virtually placed at the disposal of the territorial proprietor; upon whom the negroes were thus rendered absolutely dependent for their very subsistence. And by the erection of an inquisitorial surveillance over the minutest *movements, circumstances, and conduct* of the negroes, accompanied with the power of *examining upon oath* the party accused, as to the *matter of accusation*, and of inflicting loss of *property and personal liberty*, with *corporal punishment at discretion*, a magisterial despotism would have been established, which, if permitted to continue, would have left the friends of slavery little to regret at its extinction.

The Jamaica Highway Act contained several most oppressive enactments against the apprenticed labourers; indeed every attempt was made, where it could be done, to foist clauses into their acts oppressive to the negroes.

Upon a careful review of this subject, we are constrained to say, that His Majesty's government committed a great error in sanctioning so imperfect a piece of legislation, as the first Jamaica act; which is found wholly inadequate to secure the rights and immunities given to the apprenticed labourers, by the slavery abolition act; and that the House of Commons committed a still greater error, in confiding to the colonial legislature the power of making such subordinate arrangements, as might be deemed needful for carrying their intentions into effect. Unguarded confidence in them was not warranted by any previous act of theirs; and the consequence has been, that the decision of parliament has been in a great measure stultified, and the negroes, hitherto, little if at all benefited by the change. At all events, the House of Commons ought never to have parted with the power of exacting a rigid compliance with its solemn decisions.

In 1833, Mr. Buxton told the house how the planters would act; and begged them to reserve half the compensation fund, till the liberation of the negroes was completed. They trusted the planters, and refused his proposals. Again he told the house, in 1835, that the act passed by the Jamaica legislature was not 'adequate and satisfactory,' and begged them to keep the compensation in their hands till it was made so. Credulous still in the good intentions of the planters, they refused his proposition; and what is the result? The representative of his majesty in that colony found himself unable to carry the wishes of his majesty's government into effect. On the 4th August, 1835, the Marquis of Sligo called the House of Assembly together, for the purpose of re-enacting the Police Bill, and the act in aid of the abolition law, both expiring at the end of the year. In reference to the

former measure, his Excellency said, 'the police has been of such great public utility, as to render *its continuance absolutely essential to the preservation of tranquillity, and the maintenance of proper discipline on estates.*'

The house was impracticable; and after a short sitting of six days, during which they prepared a disrespectful reply to his message, he found himself compelled to dissolve it.

On the 13th October, the governor convened the new House of Assembly for the despatch of business; and it was expected that but little difficulty would be experienced in carrying those measures, which he had previously recommended to their adoption. The members of the new house, however, positively refused to comply with his Excellency's requisition. Disappointed by their factious opposition, his lordship, on the 16th December, sent them a message, in which he says,

'His Excellency is instructed to draw the particular attention of the assembly to the series of liberal and conciliatory measures which have marked the demeanor of the British government towards this colony during the last four years; the loan of £500,000 sterling; the dispensation from the pledge, first for one year, and subsequently continued to the present time, as to the military supplies, the acceptance of a very imperfect abolition bill, and the declaration, that it was adequate and satisfactory, in the reliance that the legislature would make the necessary amendments, and as a consequence of that declaration, the immediate recognition of the title on the part of the colony to share in the compensation fund, which is at this moment in course of payment.

'If all these sacrifices, demonstrating, as they do, the anxious desire of government to deal with the assembly upon terms of liberality and mutual confidence, are to be met by a continued resistance to the adoption of the important measures so earnestly urged upon them as connected with the abolition of slavery; if the question of a police bill is to be annually revived as long as the apprenticeship continues, his Excellency cannot admit the policy of foregoing another year's military supplies, nor would his Majesty's ministers be able to assign to the Lords of the treasury or parliament any satisfactory ground for continuing an indulgence on this point, the repetition of which has failed to produce a corresponding disposition on the part of the assembly, to conciliate and co-operate in giving effect to the great objects which parliament and the British people have so much at heart.

It was thus rendered evident, that all attempts to conciliate the planters were vain. To the last moment they will struggle to maintain their power. Habituated to the exercise of despotic authority, they deem it essential to their welfare; and listen to the language of freedom with a deep-rooted abhorrence, which Englishmen are incapable of appreciating. The hope of the negro is consequently founded on the enlightened and Christian people of this country. His expectations have hitherto been

bitterly disappointed. He has been mocked by the language of freedom, and then goaded to madness by a sense of present oppression. The cup that was handed to his lip, and of which he was about to drink with such feverish delight, has been dashed to the ground, by the folly of British statesmen, and the malignant chicanery of colonial legislators. Little has in fact been done to restore his rights, much less to recompense his wrongs. The crimes and the cruelties of ages are yet unatoned; and unless British justice and British energy interpose, even the year of jubilee, now so near, and so devoutly looked for, will close upon this ill-fated race, without witnessing their restoration to the rights and immunities of the human family.

Art. VII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The second volume of the History of Protestant Nonconformity, by the Rev. Thomas Price, is in the press, and will shortly appear.

The Twelve Minor Prophets in Coptic, with a Latin Translation, by the Rev. H. Tattam, M.A., F.R.S., has been published by the University of Oxford, the same able scholar is now preparing Ezekiel and Daniel in the same way, from Coptic MSS. in the Royal Library in Paris.

Literature and Art.—Bent's List of New Books and Engravings for 1836, with their Sizes and Prices, exhibits a decrease of New Publications last year, the number of books amounting to 1250 (1500 Volumes), exclusive of New Editions, Pamphlets, or Periodicals, being 150 less than in 1835. The Number of Engravings is 98 (including 40 Portraits), 17 of which are engraved in the Line manner, 66 in Mezzotinto, and 15 in Chalk, Aquatinta, &c.

Speedily will be published, the First Part of an entirely new work, entitled Mechanics of Fluids, comprising Hydrodynamics and Hydraulic Architecture, illustrated by Practical Examples, and numerous Engravings in Wood and Copper-Plates.

In immediate preparation, a History of British Birds, in 2 vols., by Mr. Yarrell; and a History of British Reptiles, in 1 vol., by Mr. Bell. These works, with the British Fishes, now complete, and British Quadrupeds now in course of publication, will complete a Uniform Series of the Vertebrate Animals of Great Britain, in 6 vols.

In the press, a volume of Sermons, by the late Rev. Samuel Summers, of Bristol. To be published by Subscriptions. Names received by the Rev. T. S. Crisp, Bristol, Rev. E. Steane, Camberwell, and the Rev. T. Price, Finchley.

Just ready for the press, a small volume on the Nature, Constitution, Officers, Government, Discipline of a Christian Church, Character of its Members, Objects at which they should aim, Duties which grow out of their Relation, &c., by George Payne, L.L.D., Exeter. This little work will support the principles of Congregationalism; but is intended to be explanatory and practical, rather than controversial.

Mr. H. Herring is on the point of publishing "The Napoleon Medals;" a series of 1200 Medals, struck in France, Italy, Great Britain, and Germany, in Commemoration of the principal Events of Napoleon's Life, and engraved in the same style as the "Great Seals of England," by the Process, Achilles Collas, or *new French Machine*.

Mr. Crofton Croker has announced the Life of Roger Boyle, first Earl of Orrery, who performed so conspicuous a part in the reign of Charles I., under the government of Cromwell, and in effecting the restoration of Charles II.

In the press, and will appear early in February, Proofs and Illustrations of the Attributes of God, from the facts and laws of the Physical Universe, being the foundation of Natural and Revealed Religion. By the late John Maccullock, M.D., F.R.S., &c.